DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 123 TE 499 833

AUTHOR Eddy, Junius
TITLE A Review of Projects in the Arts Supported by ESEA's Title III.
INSTITUTION Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 162.; A report to the Ford Foundation

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Art Activities, *Creative Art, *Curriculum Enrichment, *Educational Innovation, *Federal Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III

ABSTRACT

The Title III program of ESEA that supports the arts in education is discussed. Included in the report are the following topics: (1) Analysis of Projects by Art Form Category (Visual Arts, Music, Theatre, Combinations of the Arts, and General Projects that Include the Arts); (2) Analysis of Projects by Educational Function; (3) Relative Emphasis by the States on Arts Projects; (4) Art Projects after Two Years of State Administration; and (5) Outlook for the Future. (DE)

ED050123

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BESE Title III

TE/0

A REVIEW OF PROJECTS IN THE ARTS

SUPPORTED BY ESEA'S TITLE III

A Report to the Ford Foundation

by Junius Eddy

TE 499 833

August, 1970

1

ED050123

CONTENTS

An Introductory Note i

General Background 1

The Evolution of Title III 3

The Title III Grant-Making Process 16

Data Sources for This Report 30

The Scope and Variety of Title III Arts Projects 37

Analysis of Projects by Art Form Category 45

Visual Arts Projects 51
Music Projects 52
Theatre Projects 54
Combinations of the Arts 56
General Projects that Include the Arts 62

Analysis of Projects by Educational Function 66

Relative Emphasis by the States on Arts Projects 86

Arts Projects After Two Years of State Administration 98

The Transition Period 99

How the Arts Fared 102

Outlook for the Future 106

How State Coordinators View Prospects for the Arts . . . 107

Broader State Agency Concerns 111

Title III and the Arts: A Summing Up 115

References 147

AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE

In a sense, this report should be regarded as an integral part of the comprehensive study of "Federal Programs Supporting the Arts in Education" which I have been working on for the Foundation this year. The report on that study was completed in May, and this more detailed examination of one of the major titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 would normally have been included as an important section of that report.

In approaching my task, however, it seemed to me quite early that several factors about Title III of ESEA made it unique enough among federal programs supporting the arts in education to warrant separate and extended treatment. First, because of the way in which it was implemented and administered by the U.S. Office of Education, the Title III program resulted in a group of relatively well-defined projects involving the creative and performing arts which could be subjected to rudimentary analysis in a number of different ways: by art form, by principal educational function, by funding level, and by relative state emphasis on the arts, among other breakdowns.

Second, since the initial emphasis of Title III was on innovative solutions to some of the nation's crucial educational problems, this group of arts projects tended to include the most imaginative and original approaches developed under any of the federal programs which, in recent years, have supported efforts to bring the arts into the schools. Although a great deal more money appears to have been spent under Title I for these purposes, the educational

intent was essentially compensatory, and the programs were often routinely traditional, unimaginative and occasionally misguided.

In addition, although Congressional authorizations and appropriations for Title III were relatively modest compared to Title I, there was nonetheless sufficient money available -- during the first few years, at least -- to assure reasonable funding levels for several thousands of projects. Nearly 400 of these were concerned directly or indirectly with the arts -- a number which is certainly more susceptible to analysis than the 17,000 - 18,000 school systems into which Title I money flowed in far greater amounts but with far less programmatic definition. Thus, despite the fact that the state education agencies took over administration of Title III after the third year of operation, the project-by-project approach to record-keeping and the reporting procedures on a limited number of projects made it possible to keep reasonably good track of the funding levels for individual projects over periods of two or three years.

Finally, simply as a legislative instrumentality, Title III is interesting. In fact, it is probably unique among federal educational programs because of: 1) its provision for grants directly to local school systems, 2) its mandate for community involvement in project planning, 3) its lack of any matching requirement, 4) its provision for <u>planning</u> as well as <u>operational</u> grants, 5) its emphasis on innovative approaches, and 6) the competitive nature of its application process in which a large number of school systems had to meet specific proposal deadlines for a limited pot of risk money.

For all of these reasons, then, it seemed worthwhile to deal with Title III and its funding of arts projects in considerably more detail. The result was that it became virtually a separate report. Furthermore, the relevant data took far longer to assemble than originally anticipated, due largely to the fact that information about projects active in fiscal years 1969 and 1970 had to be gathered from each of the states, and then analyzed along several different dimensions.

The result, I'm afraid, suffers somewhat in overall readibility by comparison with the earlier report, particularly in those sections concerned with analysis of the data. There seems to be no way, however, to present statistical material so that it makes for easy reading.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the special assistance of my secretary, Mrs. Suzanne Best, who pulled together the basic data from the returned state questionnaires and cheerfully subjected it to all of the various tabular breakdowns I called for. Her help has been invaluable to me in the preparation of both of these federal program studies, and for all of this she has my profound thanks.

J.E.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

It has become reasonably clear by now that, in many respects, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 gave the arts in America a new lease on life during the latter half of the 1960's.

It didn't solve their basic economic dilemma by a long shot (it may, in some instances, have made it worse) but it did more to keep many arts organizations in business than any other single piece of government legislation in the nation's history. (Which may not, after all, be saying very much -- in this particular nation.) Certainly, with respect to the performing arts, this educationally-oriented program was of far greater financial importance than the bill designed exclusively to aid the arts -- the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act -- which Congress passed the same year.

There is no way of determining precisely how much was spent under all the titles of ESEA exclusively to sustain professional performing arts organizations, but I believe it would be possible to substantiate a figure on the order of $15-20 million under Title III alone, for the five year period 1966 to 1970. Add to this the additional millions which must have been spent under Title I to expose disadvantaged children to performing arts events -- and you come up with a figure that might easily be three or four times the five-year $18.9 million allocation of the National Endowment for the Arts for its regular grant programs and pilot projects (and certainly

the performing arts were not the only recipients of these Endowment subsidies).

The fact is that a bill designed primarily to serve the interests of education soon found itself being regarded as something of a cornucopia for the arts. The resulting partnerships were seldom without friction or controversy, because the Educational Establishment never really learned how to function effectively (let alone live graciously) as lord of the cultural manor, and the Arts Establishment found the relationship difficult because -- deep down -- it couldn't quite stomach being beholden to these nouveau riche administrative types. Nonetheless, many of these partnerships have endured despite the frictions, and it may be that both partners have learned how to work together more effectively in the future.

Title I of ESEA -- which provided the lion's share of the financial support for the arts under this billion-dollars-a-year legislation -- has been discussed in some detail in the earlier study. Our concern here is with Title III of this bill. It is in many ways unique as an educational instrumentality, and its particular role vis-à-vis the arts in education has largely been due to these unprecedented characteristics. Let me therefore attempt to put the title itself in perspective -- discussing briefly how it evolved, what its major purposes were, how it was implemented and administered -- in the hope that the significance of the arts projects it supported may be more adequately understood against such a background.

The Evolution of Title III

In the summer of 1964, President Johnson (who, on several occasions indicated he would like most to be remembered as "the Education President") appointed a blue-ribbon and largely anonymous Task Force on Education. John Gardner, who was then head of the Carnegie Corporation and, soon after the Task Force had submitted its report, was appointed the Secretary of H.E.W., was named chairman. Composed of a group of high-level educational theorists and practitioners from government, academia, and the private sector,[1] the Task Force was asked to take a fresh look at the whole range of educational problems facing the nation; presumably, it would attempt to bring the various strands of current educational thought to bear on these problems, and come up with recommendations for dealing with them which could be incorporated into the Administration's 1965 Education Message to Congress and, ultimately, enacted into legislation.

Within a year ESEA -- the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 -- had emerged, based in its broad outlines on the work of this Task Force. Imbedded firmly within this structure was Title III, which established a 5-year program of direct grants to local school systems for the development of "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services". It sounds rather innocuous even as I write it, or at least dull and unimaginative; and indeed it took awhile for the educational community, to say nothing of the artistic community, to recognize this title for what it was: a bold and unprecedented

piece of non-categorical educational legislation designed to help local school systems do some of the creative and innovative things they had never before been able to afford on local tax money. Because -- at a first-year authorization of $100 million -- it was over-shadowed by the financial largess of Title I (over a billion dollars a year to develop special educational programs for disadvantaged children), Title III was something of a sleeper. It nevertheless embodied two major elements which reflected the revolutionary approaches taken by President Johnson's Task Force on Education from the early stages of their deliberations.[2]

The first element was based on the Task Force's assessment of the pace of educational change over the preceding decade, and a belief on the part of its members that the basic problem was not the paucity of new ideas in education. Rather, it was finding a way to "field-test" them on a scale adequate to the needs of education today, and then speeding up the process of converting the best of these ideas from the conceptual stage to the utilitarian stage -- in the classroom. What this led the Task Force to emphasize was an instrument which would support the establishment of large-scale "model" institutions where all the essential resources could be concentrated and brought to bear on specific educational problems, as opposed to the piecemeal support of relatively small individual projects with little national visibility.

The second element was based on the Task Force's recognition of the fact that public school systems are, by and large, highly resistant to change;

that, for the most part, they engage in forward planning only in order to meet the exigencies of day-to-day operation -- or to secure passage of local operating levies that would enable them to keep on doing (for more kids) what they had been doing, albeit somewhat defensively, all along. What this led the Task Force to suggest was a change mechanism which would provide funds to a wide range of non-school institutions; in the view of the Task Force, these private non-profit groups, such as local community centers -- and indeed even arts and science centers -- would "supplement" the degree and kind of education being purveyed by local school systems. In essence, the traditional educational institutions were to be by-passed, in favor of what the Task Force hoped would be more free-swinging and therefore more responsive institutions ("centers") outside the system, which could marshal the full range of resources ("services") to infuse the existing education establishment with new blood (i.e., to "supplement" the standard diet).

One of the members of the Task Force, Harold Gores (president of the Educational Facilities Laboratories) has credited Paul Briggs, Superintendent of Schools in Cleveland, Ohio, with the germinal idea for what ultimately became the "supplementary center" concept (although Briggs' model could not be described as a non-school institution outside the system). Briggs, visiting one day with Gores, observed that the Cuyahoga River cuts the city of Cleveland in half, with Negroes largely concentrated on one side

and whites on the other. He went on to mention that he would like to try out a concept that he felt could help break down this racial isolation of school children, which was increasingly responsible for the de facto segregation of education in Cleveland: namely, he wanted to remodel an old warehouse in downtown Cleveland, develop a superior cultural program there, outfit it with top-notch equipment and first-rate teachers, and establish a year-round bussing program that would bring student groups from each enclave to this "center" daily for broadly integrated experiences. It was Briggs' feeling that, although people might be concerned about "bussing" for sociological purposes if you did it to bring the kids to school in the first place, you could do it for educational purposes after the school day started, and probably get away with it.

In any event, according to Harold Gores, he later described Briggs' idea to members of the Task Force the next time they met, and the more they considered it the more intriguing the "center" concept seemed to be. Thus, an educational approach that sought mainly to deal with the problem of racial segregation in the schools in a large northern city appears to have served as a model for the "supplementary educational center" which ultimately emerged as the core of Title III.

There were many intermediate compromises before Title III emerged in this fashion from the Congressional hopper, however. Some students of recent public policy believe that the two major thrusts described earlier -- the support of large-scale "exemplary" institutions with high visibility, and

the support of new institutions outside the system to bring about change from the outside-in -- were initially proposed by the Task Force as the underlying principles for ESEA as a whole. However, once the Task Force had submitted its report -- which, to my knowledge, never has been made public in toto -- the concepts embodied in it were subjected to the crucible that is the legislative process and the instrumentalities that were finally hammered out had been modified by the political realities of the day. Modifications were made all along the line -- by the Administration leaders who were given the job of drafting the bill; by the House and Senate committees to whom it was referred following delivery of the President's Education Message in January, 1965; by the legislative maneuverings required to get it past the Rules Committee; by floor debate; by the Conference committee deliberations; and finally, by the amount of money appropriated for the various titles once the bill became law.

The political realities the bill had to contend with were the triple-threat issues of race, religion, and the generalized fear that federal aid to education would result in federal control of the schools. They were the major issues on which general federal aid to education (as opposed to categorical aid) had historically floundered-- and they had to be faced and disposed of before ESEA became a legislative reality.

Without detailing the separate steps involved or the rationale behind the various compromises, it is enough for our purposes here simply to point out

1) that the religious issue was effectively defused by concentrating on "children" rather than "institutions," and by funneling "educational services" to non-public school children and teachers through the public schools; 2) that the race issue became less of a factor once the Civil Rights Act of 1964 began to be implemented, and 3) that "fear of the feds" caused major alterations in the Task Force's original concept of "federally-supported educational institutions" that would serve the schools from the outside.

The result was that when the act was finally passed by Congress and signed by President Johnson in April of 1965, Title I emerged as the major title. Title III, as suggested above, was something of a sleeper: it had been pulled into the background during all the debate over the church-state issue and the arguments over the criteria for determining what a disadvantaged child is -- and, furthermore, it seemed to have had its sharper, more revolutionary claws clipped to mollify the educational establishment. So it was not immediately apparent to the educational community generally that this rather dull-sounding title, with a first-year allocation of $75 million, was anything for them to get very excited over. It was only the sharp-eyed school-reformers and the Insiders (who had kept track of what was happening) who recognized Title III's potential early in the game. (It is not surprising, incidentally, to find that Paul Briggs' "supplementary educational center" was one of the first major proposals submitted for the first-round application deadline, and that the Cleveland project -- which, by the way, contained considerable emphasis on arts and humanities education -- won early approval.)

When the educational community began to look more closely at Title III it found a program designed (in the express wording of the act): "1) to establish exemplary elementary and secondary school programs which will serve as models for American education, and 2) to provide grants for supplementary educational centers and services which will supply vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality." It also found a program which had retained much of the Task Force's original concern for supporting "model" institutions where concentrated resources could be brought together -- aimed at stimulating educational change on a broad scale through replication of these exemplary approaches. Although the emphasis had shifted from institutions run by private agencies outside the system, the mechanism for feeding new ideas into the system from outside had -- to a considerable extent -- been preserved, through a mandate that seems to be unique in the annals of federal assistance to education.

This mandate had to do with citizen participation in the planning and the operation of the supplementary centers and services which Title III funds were to establish and support. Citizens at the community level were not merely "invited" to participate; their involvement was an essential condition for approval of all grant applications.

The Act was very specific about this. It stated that a grant for a Title III program "may be made to a local educational agency or agencies ...only if there has been satisfactory assurance that in the planning of that program

there has been, and in the establishing and carrying out of that program there will be, participation of persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served."

As much as anything else in the conception and implementation of Title III, this mandate for citizen participation was -- in my view, at least -- responsible for generating the extraordinary interest in Title III projects on the part of the artistic and cultural organizations which ultimately manifested itself across the country.

There were other aspects about Title III that were unique, as well, and they were not lost on potential applicants when they began to wake up to the real promise of this section of the Act. The National Advisory Council on Title III, in its recently-published report[3] on the fourth year of the program, identified "at least six unique aspects: its broad mandate; 100 percent money -- real money for the first time -- to local schools; grants awarded on a competitive basis; innovativeness and creativity emphasis; unprecedented Congressional interest" as well as the requirement for community involvement mentioned above.

Shortly after the bill was enacted, in April of 1965, the Office of Education went through one of its periodic reorganization convulsions -- but this one was more traumatic than most because few of the operating units remained untouched, and the agency was concurrently engaged in staffing up to administer the five separate titles of the new billion-dollar legislation. After some

predictable in-fighting over where Title III should be lodged administratively -- in the newly-created Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) or the Bureau of Research (BR) -- the decision was made by Commissioner Keppel to place it in BESE. This was regarded by some observers as indicative that the new title was to be more "project-and-schoolman-oriented" rather than "planning-and-academically-oriented," the feeling being that it represented a further compromise with innovation because, it was said, the built-in bureaucratic biases of BESE's administrators tended to reflect the conservatism of the local school administrators.

A new unit -- the Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers -- was soon established in BESE to administer Title III, and it was this new in-house cadre which was given the responsibility, over the summer and early fall of 1965, for developing the title's regulations, guidelines and application forms. In this process, the by-now slightly battered little innovation title was subjected to a few additional refinements and interpretations -- not all of them for the worse, by any means. For example, the guideline writers opted heavily for the planning process over the sheer acquisition of hardware, and thereby underscored another of the unusual features of this new program. The Act specifically authorized grants "for planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs ....including pilot projects, designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed." The significance of this, and particularly the "pilot projects" phrase, should

not be under-estimated; the Title III implementers were trying hard to avoid hastily-conceived, badly-thought-out proposals for operational projects, and instead to motivate schools which were unused to any rigorous kind of planning to give the process a chance before they plumped four-square into the competitive arena with an inadequate operational program. In addition, by opening up the Planning Project concept to allow applicants to conduct a field-testing phase, they were trying their best to bring the whole concept of applied research and development at the local level more fully into the Title III purview. That their hopes were seldom realized is more a comment on this particular aspect of American education generally than it is a criticism of the Title III guideline-writers.

Another refinement introduced by the guideline-and-regulations writers at this stage was the definition of innovation. It was somewhat loosely defined as "an approach new to the area introducing it," rather than something inventive for education as a whole. This had the effect of opening up the title to a great many more -- and smaller -- schools than would have been the case had a more restrictive definition been adopted.

And finally, pressure from local school administrators forced the guideline writers to open up the Title III program in another way: the original Task Force stress on major, multi-purpose, high cost, and highly-visible projects aimed at developing innovative approaches was refined by a decision that enabled Title III support to be given, as well, to the single-purpose,

broadly-scattered, low cost projects aimed at extending present services in some way. Thus both approaches received equal programmatic emphasis.

As Title III has run its course these last five years, it appears that this attempt to combine the concept of innovation with the concept of add-on services may, in the long run, have saddled the program with contradictions so severe as to fatally compromise its original intent. The latest National Advisory Committee report referred to above comes to the conclusion that "the original emphasis on innovation and creative programs is being eroded and chipped away. The drift is toward a service-type project -- something more akin to ESEA Title I programs, or those that the school system is or should be providing as part of its normal instructional program and supplementary educational services. With all the other Federal monies except Title III emphasizing the more practical aspects, we strongly believe that 'risk capital' or innovation money is essential."

As the ESEA era began, however, these contradictions in the Title III program were largely obscured by all the other baubles that had been hung on this biggest-of-all educational Christmas tree. Title I shone the brightest, of course -- because of its billion dollar commitment and its promise of virtually unrestricted money to almost every school district in the land, so long as the money was used for programs that would benefit "disadvantaged" children. The other four basic titles, though each offered only about a tenth the money of Title I, nonetheless promised something essentially non-categorical

for almost everyone -- the hardware, textbook, and instructional materials people (Title II), the innovators (Title III), the educational research and development crowd (Title IV), and the entrenched state education agencies (Title V).

But it was Title III, which was authorized $100 million of "risk capital" for its first year of operation, that ultimately generated the most excitement across the country. By the time the regulations, guidelines and application forms were mailed out, in early October, to the thousands of local school systems -- as well as to other segments of the educational community -- word had begun to get around that Title III was something really unusual.

Virtually every national association, organization, and special interest group (such as the manufacturers of school supplies and materials) devoted considerable space to Title III in their newsletters and journals during the summer and fall of 1965. As an example, the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, a Washington-based national citizens organization for which I worked at the time, decided to alert its state and local membership to the title's potential -- and particularly to the requirement for citizen participation in the planning and operation of Title III projects. Other organizations with different interests naturally featured other aspects of the program. (A copy of the article dealing with the issue of citizen involvement which I subsequently wrote for the September 1965 issue of the NCSPS Newsletter is appended to this report.)

At about the same time, U. S. O. E.'s Division of Plans and Supplementary

Centers decided to augment its guidelines and regulations with an audio-visual communications instrument that would explain Title III to state and local administrators in a more direct and immediate manner. The resulting sound strip-film, which I wrote under contract to the Office of Education, was lyrically entitled "The Promise of PACE." (PACE was an acronym formed from the phrase "Projects to Advance Creativity in Education," which the Supplementary Centers Division had dreamed up to identify the program more dramatically in terms of its basic purposes.) Somewhat more pretentious than I had hoped it would be and, I think, overly-technical in places, the strip-film was a detailed description of the new program complete with examples of the kinds of projects which DPSC officials were eager to encourage. It differentiated between planning and operational grants, took potential applicants step-by-step through the proposal development process, and described the criteria the Commissioner and his National Advisory Council would use in awarding grants. (A copy of the script for this tense and utterly compelling document is also attached to this report.)

Articles about Title III also began to appear with regularity in most of the trade magazines aimed specifically at the large national audience of school administrators -- magazines like School Management, The Nation's Schools, and American School and University. All of them were similar in slant to a report in the September 1965 issue of The Nation's Schools entitled "How to Get Title III Funds." This 18-page report told schoolmen how to plan for a project, where to get the proper application forms, what some of the more

advanced states were planning in the way of large regional supplementary centers, and it even included some sample proposals -- plus descriptions of "26 Model Programs" which local administrators were advised "to improve on, combine, or use as a starting point from which to develop new proposals to fit your area's needs."

The response to this barrage of publicity and reporting about Title III was, ultimately, overwhelming. Nearly 3000 proposals came into the Office of Education during fiscal 1966 -- which was already over three months gone by the time the guidelines and regulations were received by local school personnel. It took another three months for the initial applications to be processed and for the first round of grants to be awarded.

This grant-making process is worth considering for a moment because some of the procedures involved appear to have had an effect on the number and kind of projects in the arts which were approved during the first three years of Title III.

The Title III Grant-Making Process

Until July 1, 1968, when the 1967 Amendments to ESEA transferred major administrative responsibility for Title III to the state departments of education, the major decisions in the grant-making process were handled by the staff of U.S.O.E.'s Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers (DPSC). This newly-formed Division was headed, during its formative and guideline-writing stage, by a career Office of Education official named Ralph Becker, a man who represented the viewpoint of the traditional public school administrator

with unusual effectiveness. Under Harold Howe's regime as Commissioner, commencing in January of 1966, the original DPSC staff began to be augmented by a number of able young program officers, many of them former public school administrators who had been lured to U.S.O.E. by ESEA's promise of an opportunity to help make some genuine changes in the system. By spring Becker had been superseded as division director by Nolan Estes, a bright and imaginative school superintendent from Missouri whose commendable ambition was balanced by an administrative approach which effectively combined the academic with the pragmatic. After six months as head of DPSC, he was made Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, in charge of BESE, the bureau in which the Title III division was lodged administratively. (Becker became acting director of DPSC again and remains in this position today; Estes ultimately left U.S.O.E. to become superintendent of schools in Dallas.)

During the first two years (fiscal years 1966 and 1967), most proposals for projects which dealt specifically with arts and humanities education, or more generally with so-called "cultural enrichment" activities in the schools, were referred for in-house evaluation to the staff of the Arts and Humanities Program in the Bureau of Research. As an AHP staff member at that time, I suppose I must have read and rendered a judgment on between 60 and 75 such proposals. I wish now I had kept some sort of record of this activity, but my impression is that the proportion of really first-rate imaginative proposals was, in our collective AHP staff opinion, relatively low -- during the first

year at least.

Because the Title III Regulations established a series of deadlines for receiving applications, two or three competitive rounds for proposal consideration took place during each of the first three years of program operation. The competitive pressures were not in evidence, however, at the level of substantive review and evaluation; all any of us engaged in so-called in-house reviews took into consideration were the individual proposal documents themselves -- and our ratings were made almost entirely in terms of the following criteria, unrelated to other proposals from the same state. The key determining factors were "their innovative and exemplary nature and the need for the services requested in the case of supplementary educational centers," according to the evaluation instructions. In addition, substantive evaluation was made on the basis of the following criteria:

* The educational significance of the proposed project
* The overall project design
* Qualifications of personnel designated to carry out the project
* The adequacy of designated facilities
* The economic efficiency of the project
* Its feasibility in terms of the needs and resources of the area to be served.

Three additional conditions had to be met, however; one was the requirement for community involvement mentioned earlier. The second was a

requirement by the applicant to make provision for including children enrolled in non-profit private or parochial schools whose educational needs were appropriate to the project. The third was evidence of an effort to establish coordination between Title III and other federal programs, especially those funded under ESEA, if such a linkage seemed beneficial to the project.

The point at which the competitive nature of the Title III grant-making process came into play was, first, when representatives of the DPSC staff sat down with representatives of each state education department to consider the proposals DPSC had decided to recommend to the Commissioner for approval.

It was no secret that the state education agencies were unhappy with the basic Title III philosophy which permitted local school districts to submit applications directly to the Office of Education -- with only a review and recommendation function provided for state agencies. These agencies had jealously guarded their administrative perogatives in virtually every other federal program aiding public education, including Titles I and II of ESEA. The fact that this new program -- whose avowed intent was to produce visible and rapid educational change -- effectively by-passed them to deal directly with local agencies generated an extraordinary degree of suspicion on the part of many chief state school officers and their staffs.

Thus it was that many of these joint review meetings reportedly were stormy sessions indeed. The state officials felt, with some justification,

that they knew the educational problems of their respective states better than anyone else -- and they resented the cool objectivity with which these U.S.O.E. "outsiders" presumed to carve up their territories into "innovative projects." The Title III people (along with most other U.S.O.E. officials of this era) felt -- with equal justification -- that many state agencies were too parochial, too entrenched, and too short-sighted to move willingly or effectively toward fundamental educational change. This viewpoint held, further, that until Title V could begin to strengthen their planning and staffing capabilities, even the best of these agencies would be unable to exert the kind of forthright educational leadership the times demanded. So each side brought to these review meetings some fairly deep-seated hostilities, along with their respective lists of projects which each of the parties wanted to recommend.

Competitive pressures were exterted at this point because of the periodic deadlines imposed -- and, obviously, because of the limited funds available. The amount of money each state received, of the annual Title III appropriation, was determined as follows: a base allocation of $200,000 was made to every state, and the remainder was apportioned under a formula based, first, on the relative school age population and, second, on the total population of the state. Thus, for the first year (1966), the $75 million appropriation resulted in allocations ranging between $285,000 for Alaska and $5,996,400 for California. Twenty-three states received less than $1 million, while

only nine states received more than $2 million. By contrast, in fiscal 1968, when the appropriation reached its highest peak -- $187.8 million -- Alaska received $452,600 and California $16,499,100; that year twenty-nine states received more than $2 million, and only twelve states got less than $1 million.

The table on the following page lists the annual Title III authorizations, appropriations and obligations for the five-year period 1966-70. It will be noted that, overall, appropriations have amounted to only 37% of authorizations (and have dropped steadily year-by-year to a low of 21% in 1970). It will also be noted that, because of the program's late start in 1966, only $46 million (of the available $75 million) was obligated by the end of that fiscal year, the balance being carried over and obligated in fiscal 1967. (I will withhold comment on the Arts Projects Expenditures until later, except to underscore the fact that these expenditures were, proportionately, extremely high the first year -- amounting to 18% of the appropriation and to nearly one-third of the amount finally obligated that year.)

A final technical point should be made here regarding modifications in the original concept of awarding Title III grants strictly on the basis of innovative merit. To assure "equitable distribution of grant-awards" within a given state, Congress stipulated that four major factors were to be taken into account: "the size and population of the states, the geograhpic distribution of the population within each state, the relative need of persons in different areas of the state for the kinds of services offered, and relative

Title III: Authorizations and Expenditures, 1966 - 1970

(in thousands of dollars)

	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Totals
Authorizations	100,000	175,000	500,000	512,000	550,000	1,837,000
Appropriations [1]	75,000	135,000	187,816	164,876	116,193	678,885
Obligations	46,128 [2]	162,396	182,810	164,773	NA	--
Arts Projects Expenditures	13,568 (18.0%)	20,918 (15.4%)	24,008 (12.7%)	14,796 (8.9%)	6,116 (5.2%)	79,397 (11.6%)

[1] Appropriations run about 37% of authorizations, overall.

[2] FY 1966 funds were available for obligation in both FY 1966 and FY 1967.

[3] Overall, about 12% of the 5-year allocation was spent on arts projects of all kinds; if only half of the "General Projects which include the arts" are assumed to be valid arts projects, the percentage falls to about 9% overall.

ability of particular local educational agencies to provide those services and activities."

In view of these strictures -- and operating under the loose definition of innovation as "an approach new to the area introducing it" -- it is not surprising to find that, in the attempt to spread the money around in each of the states, a number of highly questionable grants were made and projects of high educational promise were passed over on occasion. At the same time, if the title's intent of "speeding up the pace of educational change" was to be accomplished, it is difficult to quarrel with some of the modest, single-purpose grants which were awarded to smaller school districts or to districts in isolated areas where the "relative need....for the services offered" was obviously greater.

Furthermore, many of these smaller or more remote school systems had little chance of acquiring the kind of high-powered proposal-writing talent easily purchased by sophisticated suburban districts or major metropolitan systems. Doris Kearns, in a recent article in Educational Technology, points to another aspect of this same problem. Commenting that the first batch of proposals was keenly disappointing to Title III officials, she relates the attempts of Office of Education personnel to "develop a series of plans for a "Think Tank" operation, a stimulant catalyst unit to work directly with state and local personnel, especially in weaker districts, where help was needed to develop meritorious projects -- a design unit to develop and communicate national thrusts to local programs."

Miss Kearns goes on to point out that with so few professionals to review thousands of proposals, daily chores prevented DPSC personnel from accomplishing this grand design. She observes that as a result U. S. O. E. "found itself more the passive recipient of proposals than the active stimulant and helper it was originally conceived to be. In such a situation of dependency on the written proposal, numerous potentially imaginative and exciting ideas are not implemented merely because the project writer has not documented and presented his project in a way that communicates what is being proposed." This was clearly the case with many of the smaller, more isolated schools outside the main stream of current educational practice -- as those of us who reviewed some of their early proposals can attest.

The joint review sessions, then, were understandably tense, as conflicting views about worthy proposals were debated by the respective representatives of "the Feds" and the states. Though I personally never attended any of these sessions, word had it that -- in spite of their confrontational aspects -- there were many instances in which genuine attempts were made to resolve disagreements constructively, resulting in a clearing of the air and an improved basis for cooperative effort in the future. Obviously, the law was on the side of the Office of Education, and the DPSC staff probably won a good many more contests than it lost; but it would be a mistake, I believe, to assume that they rode roughshod over the state department people or were insensitive to their viewpoints. Everyone involved was aware of the

fact that, like it or not, the public educational enterprise had to evolve as a federal-state-and-local partnership and, as Commissioner Keppel once put it, the federal government's role -- even after passage of the mammoth ESEA package -- was that of the junior partner. All the participants were also aware that, once the grants were made, there would be increasing pressures for the states and the federal agency to work together on follow-on procedures.

On the other hand, of course, opposing pressures were already at work, on and in the Congress, to remove the Title III whip from U.S.O.E.'s hands and transfer the enterprise to the state agencies as a traditional grant program. Ultimately, of course, following passage of the so-called Green Amendments of 1967, this is precisely what happened, beginning with the fourth year of Title III in fiscal 1969.

When these joint review meetings ended, the projects which survived were recommended for approval to the Commissioner of Education. In consultation with his National Advisory Committee on Supplementary Centers and Services (a presidentially-appointed body of eight citizen leaders,[4] initially), the Commissioner reviewed the recommended projects and announced the grant awards....notifying members of Congress first, so they in turn could notify the recipients in their districts and thus get some of the credit. Again, it is my understanding that this final review by the Advisory Committee was in no way a rubber stamp operation. Discussion reportedly was rigorous

among members of the committee and, on occasion, recommended projects bit the dust and some of those originally screened out were reconsidered and approved. And often, the DPSC staff were called upon to defend their decisions in both of these categories.

Clearly, at this level, the parochial and more simplistic viewpoints which tended to prevail at earlier stages of the grant-making process were superseded by viewpoints that more effectively represented national needs. The members of the Advisory Committee stood at the other end of the telescope, so to speak, and their ultimate choices could not help but reflect this broader view. Yet, certainly even this group must have had its predelictions (as did the Commissioner, Harold Howe), if only manifested by their leanings for or against specific innovative practices, their preferences for certain educational philosophies, or a sense of where the school crises might be most severe -- and so on. At this late date, however, it seems useless to speculate on the effect these predilections may have had on the kinds of projects which were ultimately approved. They worked with what they had and, within the strictures of some rather complicated legislative mandates, they brought a breadth of educational experience to bear on this grant-making process and -- it seems to me -- served it honestly and well.

The table on the following page contains the rawest kind of "numbers" data on what finally emerged from this process. Perhaps the most interesting point to be made about these figures -- ignoring, for the moment, those concerned with the arts projects -- is that something like one application in

Title III: Numbers of New and Continuation Grants Approved

(1966 - 1970)

Fiscal Year	Applications Submitted[1]	Grants Approved		Arts Projects Approved[3]		Percentage of Arts Projects to Total Projects
		New	Continuation	New	Continuation	
1966	2,706	707	--	185	--	26%
1967	1,767	1,099	507	130	90	13%
1968	1,678	596	902	63	156	10%
1969[2]	2,217	294	1,246	11	141	3%
1970	NA	NA	NA	4	88	NA
	8,368	2,695	(2,655)	393	(475)	11%

[1] Submissions include those to state agencies and to U.S.O.E.

[2] State education agencies began Title III administration with this fiscal year.

[3] Does not include data from four states and D.C. for FY 1969 and 1970.

every three submitted was ultimately approved for funding. The category showing the number of "Continuation" grants approved is significant, too, from several standpoints: 1) the continuations obviously grew larger year by year while the number of the "New" grants approved grew smaller -- underscoring the fact that a majority of the new grant approvals were two- and three-year projects; 2) it points up the fact that the processing of grant applications did not end once a "New" project was approved, since each multi-year project was scrutinized and reviewed again when it came in for its annual continuation request.

The latter point indirectly highlights one of the most deadly and time-consuming aspects of federal programs of this nature. Some projects whose approvals came through late in the fall (often because of Congressional inaction on appropriations) had only a few months free and clear to devote to project activities before it was time, due to lead-time considerations, to begin working on the continuation application for the next year! Since this effort always intruded on staff time, and involved assembling all kinds of evaluative data of the "progress report" variety, it seemed sometimes that project staff people were so deeply engaged in reporting,"evaluating" and applying for things that they hardly had time to carry on the actual work of the project with any degree of dedication or creativity. And this only refers to the grantee's problems; it is obvious what it all adds up to in terms of work for the federal program officers who, engulfed in a mindless kind of

busy-work, have to keep sending these documents endlessly through the processing mill.

But the Title III mill did indeed grind (usually more slowly than its several thousand applicants hoped) and, despite an occasional jamming of the gears, it did produce. Among its products were the nearly 400 projects that concerned themselves directly or indirectly with the arts -- and these, of course, are what this report will examine in the pages that follow.

DATA SOURCES FOR THIS REPORT

This is an appropriate point, I think, to comment on the sources I have drawn on for the data about Title III generally which appears in this report -- and to distinguish this from the facts and figures relating specifically to what I have referred to as "Arts Projects."

Essentially, the summary data on Title III as a whole was obtained from the most recent report on Title III issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in January of 1970. Entitled Focus on Innovation,[5] it was prepared by the Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers as a report on the status and operation of Title III for fiscal 1969, the first year of state agency administration of the program. In addition to summary data sheets for each state containing gross statistical information about Title III projects, and descriptions of promising projects (one in each state), the report includes a brief historical review of the development of Title III during the first four years of its operation. This historical section of the report goes into considerable detail about the problems and procedures associated with state administration of Title III during 1969. (Focus on Innovation is available in my office for those who wish to study it further.)

The H.E.W. report does not extend into the fifth year of Title III operation, fiscal 1970, which ended this last June 30th. National figures and state-by-state statistical breakdowns for 1970 will not be available at least for another six or

eight months, since they depend on reports now being prepared by each of the states.

It seemed essential, however, that this report on Title III projects concerned with the arts should cover the full five-year period of Title III operation, if at all possible -- in terms of numbers of projects, their scope and variety, and the total funds expended. Other information seemed desirable, as well: continuation data, the number of planning projects as opposed to operational projects, and, finally, some sense of the future direction of Title III with respect to the arts in education.

The only way of assembling this kind of information, through the most recent fiscal year, was to try to obtain it from officials in the fifty state departments of education. In fact, because of the way in which the states reported information about the arts projects current in fiscal 1969, even the H.E.W. report, Focus on Innovation, mentioned above, did not provide the kind of follow-on information I wanted for the fourth year of the program. So this, too, had to be obtained from state officials -- in this instance, the Title III Coordinators in each state.

The starting point for this review of arts projects was a list compiled by DPSC's Analysis Unit in the Office of Education of some 280 PACE projects dealing with art, drama, music and dance, or combinations of these arts forms, which had been funded during Title III's first three years. The list was labeled "Cultural Enrichment Projects," and it included brief descriptions of each project (taken mainly from the original proposal application), plus the actual

funds that had been awarded to each of the projects -- according to DPSC records -- during FY 1966, FY 1967 and FY 1968.

Subsequently, this list was augmented by an additional 90 projects which were included in an earlier compilation made by Evan Kern of Ohio State University for the Central Mid-western Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL), an educational research institution in St. Louis, Missouri. The CEMREL publication, entitled "PACE and The Arts," included information about 266 projects, of which all but 90 were duplicated by the DPSC list; this group of 90, however, did not contain specific funding data -- and accordingly this information, for the first three-year period, had to be obtained from the U.S.O.E. officials.

Kern had grouped his projects in seven general categories: Five dealt with projects whose major emphasis was on either visual arts, theatre, music, dance, or literature; a sixth category included projects which appeared to be combinations of these or other art forms, such as media or film; and a seventh category was comprised of projects which were general in nature but which included arts and humanities education among several kinds of activities being initiated under a broader, multi-purpose program.

Kern's approach to project grouping made considerable sense to me and I therefore incorporated it in modified form as the basis of the art-form categories listed in the present report. The absence of dance and literature (i.e., creative writing) from my categories means that both of these art forms found their way into Title III activities primarily in combination with one or more of the

other arts. In fact, dance was the exclusive focus of only two projects -- so far as I could determine -- and only one project was in creative writing (literature). These categories were therefore eliminated in the present study.

Once these 90 additional projects had been identified, expenditure data on them had to be obtained from DPSC to cover the first three years -- the years in which U.S.O.E. had had sole administrative responsibility, and in which the vast majority of "new" Title III arts projects had been initiated. The next step was more difficult: namely, finding out what had happened to all projects which, according to the DPSC data, continued to operate into the fourth year and possibly the fifth -- years when the state education departments were taking over administration of the program.

A questionnaire form was ultimately devised to elicit this essential information from the state Title III Coordinators for each of the 178 projects which apparently had <u>not</u> been terminated by the beginning of Fiscal 1969 (that is, by June 30, 1968). A second form was devised for these coordinators to provide similar information on any new projects in the arts which had been initiated after that date, when the states presumably were calling the signals. We also asked them to give us data on any arts projects active in their states during the first three years which we had missed in our original matrix. Twenty-three additional projects were unearthed in this manner, bringing the total number of projects in the survey to 393. (Copies of these two forms and of the letter sent to Title III Coordinators are reproduced on the following pages.)

THE FORD FOUNDATION
320 EAST 43RD STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

DIVISION OF HUMANITIES
AND THE ARTS

February 27, 1970

Dear

This is another of those requests for information which doubtless you dislike finding in your morning mail. I hope, nevertheless, that you can find time to provide at least some of the data I'm seeking on the several attached forms and return them to me in the enclosed envelope at your earliest convenience.

I am presently engaged in developing some reports to the Ford Foundation on the government's role in the arts in general education. My work at present is concentrated on recent developments at the elementary and secondary levels which have been supported by Federal or other public programs. Obviously, Title III of ESEA looms large in a survey of this nature and I am attempting, therefore, to obtain information about specific projects in the arts which have been funded under Title III since its inception.

David Iwamoto, of U.S.O.E.'s Plans and Supplementary Centers staff, has provided me with information about some 400 projects in this general category which were approved during the first three years of Title III's existence. However, information about what has happened to then-active projects after July of 1968, when state agencies assumed major administrative responsibility for Title III, is generally not available yet from Office of Education sources. I'm forced therefore to turn to you and your counterparts in other states for help in getting at the data I'm seeking.

Of the original 400-odd projects I referred to above, approximately 180 received Title III funds in FY 1968 and, according to OE's records, were not listed as officially "terminated" at that point in time. The projects of this nature located in your state have been listed--one to a page--on the attached work sheets, with blanks indicating the follow-on funding and continuation data that I'm seeking. Your help in providing these data, if known by your office, will be greatly appreciated.

Two other forms are also enclosed. One asks for basic data on any new Title III projects in the arts which may have been approved in your state since July of 1968. The other is aimed at other kinds of information about your state agency's relative emphasis on arts and humanities education, including but going somewhat beyond Title III concerns. It may be that Part B of this latter form asks for details outside your general area of responsibility; if so, perhaps you will be good enough to pass the form on to others in your agency, such as the Title I Coordinator, who could more readily provide such information.

If at all possible, could you try to return the forms to me within three or four weeks--by April 1, at the latest? Needless to say, your assistance in this entire matter will be deeply appreciated. In return, when my studies are completed, I'll be happy to share with you those aspects which may be pertinent to your concerns.

Finally, I should probably point out that the Ford Foundation has not in the past funded projects of this nature, and has no current plans to do so. My mission is simply to contribute as much background information as possible to the whole picture of national support of the arts in general education.

Yours cordially,

Junius Eddy
Program Advisor

JE:jw

P. S. Would it be possible for you to send me, under separate cover, a copy of your current Title III State Plan--and/or a list of current projects which are concerned with arts?

Enclosures.

IR: L69-399

TITLE III ARTS* PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRES

As indicated in the covering letter, this form has been designed to secure follow-up information about projects in the arts which appear to have received funding under Title III in FY 1968 but which -- according to USOE records -- were not designated as "Terminated" as of July 1, 1968.

We have supplied identifying information for each project listed, one to a page, and merely request that you complete the form in each instance.

IN ADDITION, however, we have included an extra blank form which we hope you will use to provide us with basic data on any additional Title III arts projects which were operational in your state at the end of FY 1968 but which have not been included in the list provided us by USOE. To assist you in identifying the kind of projects we are looking for, we have spelled out below what projects we refer to as falling within the "arts project" category. Please duplicate the blank form, before filling it in, if more than one additional project fits this category.

If you do use this form for additional projects in this category, the specific items concerned with funding data which are listed on the form may not coincide, depending on the year and duration involved. Mainly, what we are interested in, concerning funding, is year-to-year amounts, so we can arrive at a total funding figure for each project -- plus any information on continuation locally, following the project's termination. Please indicate this in the way most convenient for you, if the form does not fit the circumstances.

NOTE: Do not include, on this form, any new projects approved after July 1, 1968. A separate form has been provided for projects of this nature.

*By arts projects, we refer to those concerned with the following instructional areas: dance, music, theatre-drama, the visual arts, film study and/or screen education; in addition, we are interested in projects involving combinations of these art forms, and with general projects in which the arts are included in some fashion.

I.

TITLE III ARTS PROJECTS IN _____( )

OE Project No. _____ Category _____
(our designation)

Title _____

_____

Applicant School System _____

Last Reported Funding was $ _____ for FY _____

Current Information can be obtained from:

Name _____ Title _____

Address: _____

_____

A. Is this project still active locally this year (FY 1970)? Yes ( ) No ( )

NOTE: If "No", skip to Item B.

1) If it is, please indicate Title III funding levels for FY 1969 $_____
and FY 1970 $_____

a) Funding provided from other sources, if known. Amount: $_____ Source ____

2) Is it the state's intention to terminate the project at the end of this fiscal year?
Yes ( ) No ( )

3) If the project is to be terminated, is it likely that local authorities will continue the project activity in some manner next year? Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't Know ( )

a) If "Yes", do you think the financial support will be: about the same as at present? ( )
Higher? ( ) Lower ? ( ) Much Lower ? ( )

B. Was this project terminated at the end of FY 1968? ( ) FY 1969? ( ) (Check)

1) If this project was not terminated after FY 1968, what was Title III funding level for FY 1969? $_____

2) If now terminated, has the project activity been continued in some fashion under other funding? Yes ( ) No ( ) Don't Know ( )

3) If continuing under other funding, do you know the amount derived from:

a) The local school system $_____

b) Foundations $ _____

c) Corporations $ _____

d) Other State Programs $ _____

e) Other (_____) $_____
(please specify)

C. From what you know of this project, do you regard it as: (check more than one item if applicable)

1) Unusually successful or effective? ( ); 2) Moderately effective? ( ); 3) Generally unsuccessful or ineffective? ( ); 4) Unusually Innovative, whether "successful" or not ( ); 5) An exemplary model for other school systems? ( ).

NOTE: If you believe project is being supported mainly by the local school system at present, but you don't know the amount, please indicate by checking here ( ).

II.

NEW* TITLE III ARTS PROJECTS IN _____
(Approved by your state after July 1968)

Project No. _____ Category** _____
(see below)

Title _____
_____

Applicant School System _____

Project Director or Coordinator: _____
Address: _____
_____

1) Title III funding level in FY 1969 - $ _____ In FY 1970 - $ _____

2) Is it the State's intention to continue the project into FY 1971? Yes ( ) No ( )

3) Are other school systems cooperating with the Applicant? Yes ( ) No ( )
How many? _____ Approximate geographic area _____
(County, Region, etc.)

4) What grade levels are being served? _____

5) Approximately how many children _____ and/or teachers _____ are being served?

6) Please check any of the following functions or services being provided by this project:
   a) Teacher education: In-service ( ); Pre-service ( )
   b) Curriculum development ( )
   c) Development of new materials ( )
   d) Pilot learning center ( )
   e) Resource center ( )
   f) Attendance at professional arts performances: In the schools ( ) Elsewhere ( )
   g) Student involvement in an arts process or activity ( )
   h) Services of professional artists: (a) In residence for periods of time ( ); (b) Visiting classrooms periodically ( ); (c) Working with staff ( )
   i) Tours, Festivals, Exhibits (of works of art - performances or objects) ( )
   j) Interdisciplinary arts/humanities activities ( )

7) Brief description of project's purpose: _____
_____
_____
_____

*Please duplicate the form, if necessary, for use with additional projects.
**Music, Visual Arts, Theatre-Drama, Dance, Film or Media Study; a project combining any of these art forms; a general project which includes the arts.

III.

GENERAL INFORMATION FROM STATE EDUCATION AGENCY IN _____

A. Title III concerns generally.

1. Please indicate total Title III funds allocated to your state in FY 1969 $ _____
In FY 1970 $ _____

2. Is arts and humanities education included among the "Critical Educational Needs" in your current Title III State Plan? Yes ( ) No ( )
   a) If "Yes", and your state has assigned priorities for these needs, what relative weight has been given to "arts and humanities education"? _____
   _____

3. Whether or not arts and humanities education is listed among your State's Critical Needs, or has been given a priority ranking, do you think local school systems will be likely to place increasing or decreasing emphasis on this field in the years just ahead? Increasing ( ) Decreasing ( ).

4. Do you expect to receive new Title III proposals concerned with arts and humanities education for FY 1971 funding consideration? Yes ( ) No ( ).
   a) Would you hazard a guess at how many? _____
   b) Would you hazard a guess at the percentage of Title III funds likely to be allocated to such activities? _____

5. Do you think it likely that your state's Title III program will, in the near future, begin to place increasing emphasis on projects and programs in arts and humanities education? Yes ( ) No ( )

6. If "No", please check below any items that are applicable:
   a) such projects are usually too costly on a per-student basis ( )
   b) such projects do not lend themselves readily to objective assessment ( )
   c) other educational needs are of more urgent priority ( )
   d) Other: _____

B. Broader state agency concerns.

1. Does your state have a specific unit concerned with arts and humanities education (i.e.: Office of.... Division of .... etc.)? Yes ( ) No ( )
   a) If "Yes", how large is the professional staff? _____
   b) If "Yes", what arts disciplines are represented? _____
   (i.e.: art, music, humanities, etc)
   c) If "No", is it likely that such a unit will be established in your agency in the near future? Yes ( ) No ( )
   d) If "No", does your agency now maintain full-time staff positions (specialists, supervisors, etc.) in any of the following categories? 1) art education ( ); 2) music education ( ); 3) theatre education ( ); 4) dance education ( ); 5) humanities education ( ). (Please check).

2. To your knowledge, has Title V of ESEA been utilized to add staff positions or otherwise strengthen your agency capability in any of the fields listed above? Yes ( ) No ( ). If "Yes", please specify: _____

_____

3. To your knowledge, are state funds (as opposed to state-administered federal funds) under equalization or other state support programs being utilized to any significant extent by local school systems to upgrade or strengthen arts and humanities education? Yes ( ) No ( ). If "Yes", please list several local school systems where this is taking place: _____

_____

4. To your knowledge (or that of your Title I coordinator), are Title I ESEA funds being utilized to any significant extent by local education agencies to reach, teach and motivate disadvantaged children by employing arts resources and/or techniques? Yes ( ) No ( ).

a) If "Yes", could you provide details for any outstanding examples in the spaces below:

1. Name and Local School System: _____
   Title of Project: _____
   Educational Level: _____
   (Pre-school, elementary; secondary; etc.)
   Art Form(s) Involved: _____
   (including ethnic art forms or works of art)
   Function of Project: _____
   (teaching or learning tools in their classroom; use of materials; teacher training; "cultural enrichment", etc.)
   Approximate Funding to date: _____

2. Name of Local School System: _____
   Title of Project: _____
   Educational Level: _____
   (Pre-school; elementary; secondary; etc.)
   Art Form(s) Involved: _____
   (including ethnic art forms or works of art)
   Function of Project: _____
   (teaching or learning tools in the classroom; use of materials; teacher training; "cultural enrichment", etc.)
   Approximate Funding to date: _____

I must bear full responsibility for the weaknesses and complexities of these forms. I make no pretense at extensive experience in devising questionnaires, and I am sure that we received misleading or incomplete information about some projects because, in my effort to be logical and thorough, I forgot the element of simplicity. I knew what kind of information I wanted but I'm afraid the Coordinators or members of their staffs who filled out the forms may have failed to read "the small print" carefully enough to determine exactly what I was asking for. Some of their responses indicate confusion, no doubt about it; but although this may have resulted in minor inaccuracies here and there, I don't believe it alters the major patterns of the numbers, percentage, or expenditure data to any significant degree. For that matter, I know there are similar errors here and there in the expenditure figures we obtained from U.S.O.E. -- several project directors, with whom I checked for specifics about their own projects, found discrepancies in the annual funding data. Again, it seems not to have been extensive -- perhaps only a matter of higher or lower amounts for a given year that were compensated for the next, so that the five-year totals are close to the actual figure if each of the annual figures are not.

All of which merely underscores an important point about all of the data in this report which deals specifically with arts projects: namely, that I can make no claim to absolute accuracy whatsoever. I have taken the information people have given me and tried to organize it in ways which seem to provide

interesting insights about the broad pattern of this particular federal program. In the process, I have had to make some arbitrary judgments with respect to the assignment of a given project's funds to a particular fiscal year. Which is to say that -- in addition to my own role in causing some misleading information to be supplied on a few of the forms -- our state informants and our U.S.O.E. sources did not always agree on these matters, either, and in these instances we had to make a choice.

On the other hand -- rising mildly to my own defense -- I should probably re-emphasize the fact that absolute accuracy about project funding was certainly not among the purposes of this report, even if it were possible to achieve it within the vagaries of statistical reporting on federally-supported programs. The intent was to secure figures which would adequately convey general trends, overall patterns, and relative relationships, and I am satisfied that the data can be relied on to do this. It must simply be understood that 1) the survey may indeed have missed a few projects here and there; 2) the expenditure figures should be regarded as general approximations; and 3) the functional break-downs of projects into specific categories are based mainly on proposal descriptions and are therefore somewhat arbitrary.

With this understood, I need only re-emphasize that the <u>five year</u> analyses of <u>arts projects</u> derive from data obtained in this manner from State Title III Coordinators. (Only four states -- Indiana, West Virginia, Alaska, and Georgia -- and the District of Columbia did not respond, so the summary data is inaccurate

to this degree.) Four-year totals, on the other hand, are all that is possible for Title III overall -- except with regard to state allocations, etc., where the fifth-year figures are known.

Finally, I should add that several other kinds of information were requested from these Title III Coordinators in conjunction with this project-by-project survey. Partly, it was information concerning the future of arts and humanities education under Title III, and partly, it dealt with other aspects of state education agency policy and practice with respect to the arts in education. A detailed analysis of these responses -- and some observations about them -- will be undertaken in a later section of the report.

With all this in perspective, then, it's time to consider the results of this informal survey and see what the trends, patterns and relationships concerning Title III arts projects actually turn out to be over the first five years.

THE SCOPE AND VARIETY OF TITLE III ARTS PROJECTS

Under the five broad arts categories described in the preceding section, 393 projects in the arts were approved for funding during ESEA's first five years. if the one-in-three approval-submission ration for Title III as a whole held true for arts projects, then close to 1200 individual proposals in this category were submitted during this period. The table on page 27 indicates further that, with 475 "continuation actions" many of these projects were in operation for more than one year.

The fact which intrigues me most about this table, however, is that nearly half of all the arts projects funded during this five-year period were approved the first year -- a year, it will be recalled, in which proposal submissions were delayed until the fall because the guidelines for preparing them weren't distributed until early October. In spite of this, however, 185 arts projects were approved -- 26 percent of the total first-year grants awarded.

There seems to be no particular pattern to this unusually high degree of first-year arts activity; it doesn't appear, for example, to have been concerned inordinately with one art form, or with one particular educational function (i.e., summer arts workshops perhaps, or curriculum development work, or the use of artists in the classroom). If anything, it appears that projects concerned either with bringing professional performing arts groups into the schools or bussing youngsters to performances elsewhere received a relatively high

preponderance of first-year approvals -- and this suggests a relatively higher number of proposal submissions in this category the first year. Out of a total of 33 projects which were primarily devoted to these performing arts activities, 22 were apparently funded the first year. Another category which seemed to have a higher percentage of first-year approvals was that concerned with "General Projects that Include the Arts" (a category I described briefly in the last section and which, for simplicity's sake, I shall refer to from now on as "GPIA Projects" or "General Projects").

I don't suppose anyone can say with certainty why it was that school officials opted so heavily for the arts in their early Title III proposals. But it would appear that as many as 550 proposals may have been submitted that first year, assuming the three-to-one submission-approval ratio applies. In retrospect, however, it seems to me there were at least three major factors that made the climate surrounding Title III highly appropriate to educational projects involving the arts -- and thus to a flood of first-year submissions, which in turn resulted in the subsequent high approval rate.

First, the concept of a "supplementary" service or center was a factor in and of itself. The guidelines stressed the idea that any proposed Title III activity must supplement the existing educational program in some way and provide "vitally needed educational services not now available in sufficient quantity or quality." This, in effect, said to school officials that Title III would support projects aimed at bolstering a major weakness in their regular programs. It didn't take them long, in reviewing the weak spots in their systems, to stumble

hard against the arts and humanities -- or, rather, the neglect and (therefore) the virtual absence of same. If any instructional program was less "available in sufficient quantity or quality " than education in the arts, it would have been hard for most schoolmen to identify it. It must therefore have seemed like a kind of miracle to have a federal program offer them the possibility of 100 percent money to upgrade a part of the program they knew they had neglected over the years, doubtless felt mildly uneasy about, but had never been able to support adequately on local funds because they couldn't convince their school boards and taxpayers it was important enough. The ways they sought to correct these deficiencies through Title III projects are, indeed, the substance of this section of the report -- and will be analyzed from several standpoints in a moment.

The second factor grew out of the first, in some respects. It was simply that "innovation" was the watch-word of Title III and, since innovation had been defined as "an approach new to the area introducing it," local schoolmen simply looked around them and -- lo and behold, they found the arts once again! They observed that, for the most part, education in the arts and humanities was in no better shape anywhere else in their general area, so almost any approach they might adopt to strengthen that part of their own programs would, by definition, be innovative to the area. Thus, by moving experimentally into these instructional fields, they might well be able to develop "exemplary" programs that could serve as models for other schools in their area -- and perhaps, if the plan were bold and imaginative enough, for the entire nation. And this, of course, was precisely what Title III was all about.

Furthermore, the Title III emphasis on centers stimulated the project planners to look beyond their own systems for innovative ways of providing these vitally needed services. Joining with other local districts in their areas whose educational needs were similar -- and generally encouraged in this approach by university and state education agency consultants -- they often formed consortiums to establish local or area-wide supplementary centers. One district (frequently a major metropolitan system) would then become the "applicant district" for a project serving, on occasion, as many as a hundred or more local districts from a single regional center. Most, to be sure, were far less grandiose, geared instead to serving all the schools in a single county, or sometimes a cluster of counties in one region on a state.

It is not happenstance that many of these new institutions turned out to be centers in which to develop educational programs of a cultural nature. They went by many names: Marshall, Minnesota, for example, received approval for a grant to plan a "Cultural Opportunities Resource Center." Dodge City, Kansas, obtained an operational grant to establish what it called a "Cultural Heritage and Arts Center." Allegheny County, in Maryland, established an operational project called "A Community Cultural/Curriculum Center." And in Florida, Gainesville established "A Cultural Enrichment Center," Jacksonville an "Art Education Media Center," while the Escambia County Board in Pensacola received first-year approval for a project (still in operation, by the way) called "The Escambia-Santa Rosa Humanities Curriculum Center."

These projects -- and there are many more with similar titles -- highlight

the third major factor accounting for the special appeal of the arts on the part of Title III applicants. This has to do with the title's mandate for citizen participation in Title III activities -- specifically, in the words of the act, the "participation of persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served." When local school officials followed that mandate with any degree of honest interest and commitment, it led them rather quickly into the domain of the libraries, art galleries, and museums, the ETV and radio stations, the resident professional theatres, orchestras, and operas, and dance groups. It led them, as well, to consider the cultural heritage concerns of the ethnic minorities, and the possibility of tapping in, somehow, to the arts environment of the area's institutions of higher education. It was at about this time -- when fiscal 1966 was not more than half gone -- that many of these cultural and educational groups themselves began to be bombarded by their national associations, or through other informational channels, about their respective roles as potential providers of Title III services; and as the schoolmen were coming looking for them, they were beginning to seek an audience with their local school officials -- and the two groups more or less met head-on.

The result, in the most enlightened systems, was often a series of meetings with these "broadly representative" persons, and this, in turn, often led to a planning grant which provided an opportunity for whole teams of community resource people to sit down with the educators and review a wide range of Title III program possibilities. It was really an extraordinary process -- a period of genuine school - community cooperation. And it was out of this kind of broad community

involvement in the planning of educational programs that projects with a strong emphasis on cultural values came to be developed, submitted and ultimately approved for operational funding. The cultural education center -- by whatever name -- became one of the most familiar forms for projects of this kind.

Depending on size, location and purpose, such a center offered the possibility of centralizing a great variety of functions benefiting its constituent school districts. Some functioned as coordinating agencies for sub-contracted services that flowed out from the center to the schools: tours by performing arts organizations, traveling teams of creative or performing artists or arts specialists who worked intensively with local teachers or students, or mobile units which brought museum, library, or other cultural enrichment materials on scheduled tours of area schools. Other centers simply served as places to house jointly-used equipment and to conduct multi-district activities -- and the schools came to them. A central staff usually planned and organized teacher training seminars, led special workshops for students, or headed up curriculum development work in various instructional fields -- many of them interdisciplinary in nature. The most ambitious of these centers functioned in several capacities, of course.

It is such broad-gauged projects as these that make up a large proportion of the "General Projects" category. Not always -- but more often than not -- they were projects which established supplementary centers on the order of those described above.

The 168 projects of this nature screened into the study are essentially of two

kinds: they are either projects which strongly invade the province of the arts and humanities, such as the cultural centers mentioned above where the arts serve as the primary cultural resource; or they are projects which have no single subject matter emphasis but which, nonetheless, include education in one or more of the arts -- along with other instructional fields -- among the multiple services provided. An example of the latter might be a project -- not necessarily focused on a center -- which seeks to upgrade the humanities generally and is therefore concerned with organizing a wide range of teaching and learning resources to improve instruction in English, Art, Music, and the Social Studies. It might be an Arts and Sciences Center, designed to provide enriching experiences in both of these fields, or it might be a project stressing the development of a particular minority group culture, in which -- for example -- the study of their cultural heritage by Mexican-American students in the Southwest would certainly include the essential contributions of the arts.

As nearly as I can tell from the project applications and descriptions, perhaps a third of these GPIA projects are of the former kind -- that is, with a major arts emphasis. An example of this type can be found in this description of an Operational (as distinct from Planning) Project in Cresson, Pennsylvania, which established a "Cultural and Educational Opportunity Center"

> "....to increase the cultural level in a four-county region by providing the schools with new instructional materials and exhibits. The center /has/ five basic objectives:
>
> 1) to provide an economical way of bringing exhibits of cultural artifacts to the local schools;
>
> 2) to rent or purchase new and exemplary fine arts instructional materials...too costly for any single district to afford;

3) to act as the agent in providing contracted cultural enrichment programs for the schools of the region;

4) to coordinate and plan an extensive feasibility study and evaluation of regional needs for program expansion and development in the cultural and educational areas; and

5) to offer an opportunity for all the school children and their teachers, in the region, to have direct personal experiences with the visual and performing arts and related literature, regional history, and the humanities.

In order to accomplish these objectives, the program will provide circulating exhibits in art, music, drama, dance, history, and natural history. Professional and amateur demonstrations, productions, and educational performances will be provided. Short in-service seminar-type workshops will be conducted for teachers in the arts and humanities. In the summer of 1968 a fine arts summer camp is planned."

By way of contrast, here is a description of a project that includes but does not emphasize the arts: it is an Operational Project establishing "The Upper Red River Valley Project" in Grand Forks, North Dakota. Essentially this project set up an educational service center housing the administrative staff and providing the base from which specialists operated in bringing a variety of services to the consortium of area schools involved. The project description states that:

"....professional aid in music, art, remedial teaching, counseling, curriculum and in-service training are among the services offered. Video-tape recorders will be used to extend services to schools too small to support resident specialists in cultural advantages, psychological and remedial services.

The specific sub-section of the project concerned with the arts is then described as follows:

The center will provide guest lecturers and artists who will perform or demonstrate and discuss the backgrounds of their specialties. Whenever possible, art collections from schools inside or outside the project will be presented on a rotating basis. Personnel who can assist children having special talents will provide consultative services. Intramural and interscholastic productions of local talent exhibits and performances will be encouraged and assisted."

The above description, it seems to me, says a great deal about the cultural isolation and the problems of aesthetic illiteracy found in rural America merely by explaining how simply and unpretentiously the new center proposed to meet these problems. In this respect, it provides an added dimension (perhaps even pathos) to the point I made earlier about small, isolated school districts facing difficulties in the development of projects and proposals that the larger, more sophisticated systems seldom come up against. It is typical, too, of the kind of "add-on services" project which, though doubtless desperately needed by the schools in this region, offers little in the way of educational innovation except the fact that the services themselves are new to the area. And finally, of course, it does typify the general project which includes education in the arts among the multiple services it offers.

Analysis of Projects by Art Form Category

It is now time to move to a more detailed analysis of the kinds of Title III projects that actually resulted from this inordinate interest in the arts on the part of local school officials.

The table on page 22 indicates that $13,568,000 was spent on Title III arts projects during fiscal 1966; this was 18 percent of the appropriation but about 30 percent of the funds actually obligated. In fiscal 1967, the expenditures rose to $20,918,000 which was 15 percent of the appropriation; in fiscal 1968, $24,008,000 was spent on arts projects, the peak expenditure year during the entire five-year period -- but the ratio sank to about 12 percent of appropriations.

In fiscal 1969, the first year under state administration of Title III, arts spending dropped sharply -- to $14,796 (9 percent); and in fiscal 1970, it virtually hit bottom, at $6,116,000 or about 5 percent of appropriations. Over the full five years, arts project expenditures averaged about 12 percent of appropriations.

As I mentioned earlier, over a fourth of the 700-odd projects approved for FY 1966 funding were projects concerned with arts and humanities education. This high percentage did not last, either, of course. The table on page 27 shows that the ratio of arts projects to total projects approved fell off sharply in succeeding years -- to 13% of the total in FY 1967, to 10% in FY 1968, and finally to 3% in FY 1969. (No percentages are possible for FY 1970 because, although we know the number of arts projects this last year, the figures are not yet available on the total number of grants approved by the state education agencies. The number of new arts project grants speak for itself, however: only 4 new projects approved, plus 88 continuations, making a total of 92 arts projects in operation this last year -- as nearly as we can determine from the information provided by the state Title III Coordinators.)

My analysis of the data provided us by these coordinators and by U.S.O.E. officials will take three forms: first, I will present the figures on numbers of projects and expenditures for each state, broken down by art form category; second, I will take a cut along a different dimension and examine the data on the numbers of projects from the point of view of educational (or aesthetic) function, without reference to individual states; and third, I will take a look at the pattern revealed

when the amount of money each state spent on the arts is compared to the total amount of money each state received for all Title III activities. In each instance, the figures cover the entire five year period, FY 1966 through FY 1970.

The table on the following page, entitled "State Expenditures and Numbers of Projects by Art Form, 1966 - 1970", is a state-by-state breakdown by art form category. Overall, it reveals the following totals:

Numbers of Projects	Art Form Category	Five-year Expenditures	Percentage of Total Arts Project Expenditures
27	Visual Arts	$2,707,132	3%
55*	Music	$7,304,082	9%
20	Theatre-Drama	$5,841,659	7%
123**	Combinations of the Arts	$23,903,038	30%
168	General Projects that Include the Arts	$39,641,472	50%
TOTAL: 393		$79,397,338	99%***

* Includes 2 dance projects amounting to $61,000.
** Includes 1 project in the literary arts amounting to $28,000.
*** Discrepancy of 1% is result of rounding off percentages.

A comment or two is in order, at this point, before I procede to a discussion of these categories in more detail. First, I should point out that we have not included a major category for projects in dance. As far as can be determined, only two

Title III and The Arts

State Expenditures and Number of Projects by Art Form

1966 - 1970

	Visual Arts		Music		Theatre		Combination Of The Arts		General Programs Including The Arts		Total	
	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount	No.	Amount
Alabama	1	96,954	2	363,499	0	000	4	938,863	1	62,940	8	1,462,256
Alaska	0	000	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	306,209	1	306,209
Arizona	0	000	1	550,874	0	000	1	61,352	2	505,594	4	1,117,820
Arkansas	0	000	0	000	0	000	5	1,686,872	2	94,643	7	1,781,515
California	1	409,276	3	319,146	4	1,419,829	5	1,295,610	6	2,605,885	19	6,049,746
Colorado	2	529,832	0	000	0	000	2	462,483	9	953,139	13	1,945,454
Connecticut	0	000	3	327,043	1	242,907	1	455,725	2	697,784	7	1,723,459
Delaware	0	000	1	62,707	0	000	2	270,825	0	000	3	333,532
District of Columbia	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	82,767	0	000	1	82,767
Florida	2	91,846	1	181,645	1	301,907	3	915,406	5	525,241	12	2,016,045
Georgia	0	000	0	000	0	000	4	485,165	3	503,543	7	988,708
Hawaii	0	000	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	268,247	1	268,247
Idaho	0	000	0	000	0	000	2	155,817	1	27,703	3	183,520
Illinois	0	000	0	000	0	000	7	1,692,831	6	1,189,183	13	2,882,014
Indiana	1	98,746	0	000	0	000	2	52,296	4	1,193,311	7	1,344,353
Iowa	0	000	2	441,875	0	000	0	000	0	000	2	441,875
Kansas	1	158,967	0	000	0	000	1	433,723	4	650,753	6	1,243,443
Kentucky	0	000	1	57,375	2	239,135	1	242,295	1	115,551	5	654,356
Louisianna	0	000	0	000	1	1,210,908	1	422,694	4	841,467	6	2,475,069
Maine	0	000	2	443,690	0	000	2	225,536	2	167,250	6	836,476
Maryland	1	103,660	1	15,814	0	000	2	168,109	3	569,179	7	856,762
Massachusetts	1	145,475	1	41,328	1	282,615	4	861,224	5	828,405	12	2,159,047
Michigan	0	000	2	204,305	0	000	1	23,714	1	132,749	4	360,768
Minnesota	0	000	4	414,077	1	648,630	3	235,502	3	120,417	11	1,418,626
Mississippi	0	000	1	4,250	0	000	4	791,763	1	573,865	6	1,369,878
Missouri	0	000	0	000	0	000	4	927,151	0	000	4	927,151
Montana	1	8,240	0	000	0	000	2	101,025	6	562,614	9	671,879
Nebraska	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	40,307	0	000	1	40,307
Nevada	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	99,937	0	000	1	99,937
New Hampshire	0	000	0	000	2	261,370	2	524,572	2	195,079	6	981,021
New Jersey	2	57,440	3	368,606	1	56,765	2	905,215	5	1,550,218	13	2,938,244
New Mexico	0	000	1	54,924	1	33,924	0	000	5	1,140,197	7	1,229,045
New York	2	337,519	5	468,389	0	000	10	2,903,726	16	3,731,906	33	7,441,540
North Carolina	3	179,874	0	000	0	000	13	1,853,370	8	1,096,125	24	3,129,369
North Dakota	0	000	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	595,140	1	595,140
Ohio	2	34,426	1	25,250	1	11,892	4	1,046,271	14	3,691,895	22	4,807,734
Oklahoma	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	1,251	7	1,775,110	8	1,776,361
Oregon	2	162,067	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	298,619	3	460,686
Pennsylvania	1	95,948	2	304,848	1	17,683	9	922,993	10	4,047,709	23	5,389,181
Rhode Island	0	000	1	139,791	1	851,136	2	354,507	1	10,681	5	1,356,115
South Carolina	0	000	1	29,661	0	000	3	55,037	5	241,567	9	326,265
South Dakota	1	2,100	0	000	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	2,100
Tennessee	0	000	2	237,704	0	000	0	000	4	3,165,689	6	3,403,393
Texas	0	000	3	1,257,325	0	000	2	350,817	7	948,192	12	2,556,334
Utah	1	85,366	3	126,927	0	000	0	000	0	000	4	212,248
Vermont	0	000	1	11,735	0	000	0	000	0	000	1	11,735
Virginia	0	000	1	235,132	1	226,700	1	294,902	4	1,511,656	7	2,268,390
Washington	0	000	3	568,173	1	36,258	2	312,207	2	1,426,504	8	2,343,142
West Virginia	0	000	2	49,989	0	000	2	300,792	2	660,030	6	1,010,811
Wisconsin	0	000	0	000	0	000	4	948,386	1	59,483	5	1,007,869
Wyoming	2	109,396	0	000	0	000	0	000	0	000	2	109,396
TOTALS:	27	2,707,132	55	7,304,082	20	5,841,659	123	23,903,038	168	39,641,472	393	79,397,338

Note: Incomplete data was received from Alaska, the District of Columbia, Georgia, Indiana, and West Virginia. Totals for these states may actually be higher, therefore.

projects with an exclusive emphasis on dance were funded during the entire five years. One was a $15,000 planning grant to the Long Beach, New York, schools to work with the ethnic dancer, Pearl Primus, to develop an ethnic dance group from among interested high school students; the other was a $46,000 Operational grant to the North Plainfield, New Jersey school system to augment its performing arts program by establishing a modern dance program, including symposiums, in-service training for teachers and professional performances.

This does not imply that Title III paid no attention to dance. Actually dance activities and experiences were often included in projects that involved combinations of the arts (New York's "Huntington PACE Project" is a good example), and occasionally they were included in the GPIA projects as well. In both instances, however, the activities were likely to be aimed at developing an appreciation for the dance in performance rather than involving the student in dance activities himself. For reasons of space, then, we have eliminated dance as a separate category on this summary table, and arbitrarily included these two projects in the Music category.

The same thing is true of projects in media, including those concerned with film-making, or with the use of ETV to supplement classroom teaching (particularly in sparsely-populated sections of the country), and other programs in which visual communications techniques and devices were involved. Because of the visual elements, however, such projects -- when they dealt <u>exclusively</u> with film, TV, or radio -- have been placed in the Visual Arts category. In projects where media techniques or devices were found in combination with other art forms, or as

minor parts of general projects, they were listed in those two categories respectively. At the most, about 17 projects were identified in which media was either a major or a minor element, ranging from projects in which actual film-making was taught to projects in which the media arts were used to present material in other subject matter fields or to assist in teaching about one or more of the arts.

The General Projects category also includes a single project in the literary field. No attempt was made to deal specifically with literature as an art form in the present study, although a number of projects in the Combined Arts or GPIA categories included creative writing as part of a concern for creative expression generally. Often these projects dealt broadly with the creative arts in the context of humanities programs of an inter-disciplinary nature. The project alluded to above -- a $28,000 Operational project in Rochester, New York, to develop a literary periodical for students in a 9-county area -- was included originally in the CEMREL list and has therefore been included here.

Finally, with about two projects in every five identified as GPIA Projects, and such projects accounting for precisely half the expended funds, this category looms large in the summary table, and therefore in the pattern of Title III arts projects as a whole. It is because of this factor that I have taken such pains to describe the nature of these projects in some detail earlier in this section. Certainly it would be a mistake to assume that all of the money in this category -- the nearly $40 million -- was spent exclusively on the arts, per se. It would be

equally rash to exclude such projects entirely on this score. They do indeed involve the arts, either heavily or in part; and, in general, it seems fair to state that their emphasis on "cultural activities" or what the schools like to refer to as "cultural enrichment" suggests learning experiences and activities that depend significantly on the development of the aesthetic sensibilities of the students involved.

The aspects of these projects which stress other kinds of teaching and learning experiences, or seek to develop other elements of the instructional program are extremely difficult to isolate -- at least in terms of the money expended. In a multi-purpose supplementary center, for example, in which two of its five stated objectives might have a direct relationship to the arts, it would probably be unfair to assume that only 40 percent of its total funds were spent on such activities -- particularly if those two parts were devoted to tours or performances by professional arts organizations to any major extent. So, rather than exclude these projects completely, or attempt to assess what part of their funding was exclusively arts-related, I have simply decided to stress the qualifications that readers of this report must bear in mind when confronted by total expenditures that include these GPIA Projects.

In what follows, I should emphasize that whenever costs are given for specific projects they are always the total costs. In the large-scale, more expensive projects, these usually indicate a project of two or three years duration. Federal support of Title III projects was usually terminated at the end of three years.

With this much said, then, let's examine each art form category more closely.

Visual Arts Projects

A state-by-state analysis of projects in the Visual Arts category indicates that the heaviest expenditure was in a group of nine states -- California, Colorado, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and Wyoming -- each of which spent over $100,000 on a total of 15 projects of this nature. Colorado spent the most ($529,832 on two projects), while South Dakota's total Title III expenditure for the arts was $2,100 spent on a single visual arts project. (This was a film and media study project, as it happens, in an all-girl parochial high school in Watertown, South Dakota, and funded in FY 1970.) California, Colorado and New York together spent almost half the five-year visual arts total -- $1,276,500 on five projects.

One state -- North Carolina -- supported three projects adding up to $179,874. Wyoming, Oregon, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, Florida and Colorado each supported two projects each; and thirty-three states had no projects exclusively concerned with the visual arts.

Noteworthy projects in the three biggest-spending states include: a $251,000 program in New York City which offered "Creative Art Classes" to public and parochial students in grades 3 to 9 in some sixty centers to provide "enriched experimental art experiences;" a $409,000 project in San Bernardino, California, called the "PACE-SIM Visual Arts Project," which established a supplementary art education program in a three-county area that used art mobiles, visiting

artist-demonstrators, community art exhibits, and created an area visual arts center; and a project in Colorado called "Teaching Art Through New Media," which utilized open-circuit ETV to transmit 32 lessons in art history and appreciation each semester to stimulate high school students toward a greater awareness of art. This project originated in the Denver schools and served students in a six-county area. Including a one-year planning grant, this entire project was funded at a cost of nearly $530,000. Participating schools were furnished with color television receivers, slide projectors, and an instructional kit for teacher use, plus a handbook to provide students with additional factual and descriptive information.

Music Projects

In the Music category, it appears that each of twelve states spent $300,000 or more on some 33 separate projects; eighteen states spent amounts in excess of $100,000. The states of Washington, Texas, and Arizona together spent $2,376,400 , just one-third of the total funds supporting music projects.

The most impressive projects in these states were: the "State of Arizona Supplementary and Innovative Music Enrichment Project" in which that state used $551,000 to organize tours of chamber music and choral groups, and of "outstanding symphony orchestras," to bring concerts to students and adults throughout the state; and two Seattle projects, "Enrichment Through Music" and "Cultural Creativity Through Opera," which utilized the Seattle Symphony and the Seattle Opera Association to bring live musical and operatic performances to students

both in the Seattle area and outside it, "in rural and sparsely-populated areas not accessible to music enrichment programs." Including planning grants, these two programs were funded at a total of about $568,000.

In Texas, three music projects costing well over a million dollars were funded in 1966 and 1967. One was a massive $800,000 program originating in Johnson County called "Project MUSE," which was described as "a music education service to provide cultural enrichment for the elementary school children of the North Central Texas Area." It offered these children "an individualized program of music orientation and appreciation ....performed by several small musical ensembles to be followed by concerts by the Fort Worth Symphony." A second project was called (take a deep breath!) "Instructional Music Services Emphasizing Its Interrelation with Other Arts," a $300,000 program in the San Antonio schools in which the San Antonio Symphony was "utilized as a resource in developing an instructional music series emphasizing the arts in the secondary schools." And a third Texas project of some size ($180,000) sought to serve 126 districts in 18 counties through a pilot program to test and develop music education programs using ETV. Called "Exploring the Use of Educational Television and Video Tape in Music," the project was based in Dallas and had the assistance of the Dallas Symphony in developing teaching aids.

Another noteworthy project was the "Music in Maine" program which received all but $500 of that state's total $443,000 music expenditure to develop -- with the assistance of Young Audiences, Inc. -- a small chamber orchestra to bring a series of live musical presentations to grade-school students throughout the

the state.

In terms of numbers, New York sponsored the most projects (5 at a total of $468,000); Minnesota had four; California, Connecticut, New Jersey, Texas, Utah and Washington each had three, and seven other states supported two each. Projects exclusively devoted to music found no favor whatsoever in twenty-three states.

Theatre Projects

In the Theatre category, the 20 projects on which nearly $6 million was spent ranged themselves in a slightly different pattern. Here, nine states spent in excess of $200,000 each on their theatre projects. Three states -- California, Louisiana, and Rhode Island -- jointly spent $3,471,000, nearly one-third of the total funding for theatre. These are the three states, of course, which took part in the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program, and about $3,210,000 of the three-state total given immediately above represented Title III's share of that program. Additional support for this 3-city program was also provided by Title IV of ESEA (through the Bureau of Research's Arts and Humanities Program) and by the National Endowment for the Arts, making it -- at over $6 million -- the largest single federally-sponsored arts in education program in the country's history. This program has been given more extensive treatment in the earlier report reviewing all other federal programs supporting the arts in education and will, therefore, not be dealt with at further length here.

In terms of numbers of projects, one state -- California — supported four

projects exclusively devoted to theatre; Kentucky and New Hampshire had two each, while 12 states funded one project each. A number of these states placed their emphasis heavily on the exposure-to-performance type of program, often relying on a resident professional company in the state to provide the student performances:

* In Minnesota, the Guthrie Theatre was involved in such a program during most of these years, at a total cost of about $650,000;

* In Florida, the State Theatre of Florida (ASOLA) in Sarasota was engaged in a similar venture, on a budget amounting to about $302,000;

* In Virginia, the Virginia Museum Theatre brought professional productions to high school students in 19 school districts around the state at a cost of nearly $230,000;

* The Actors Theatre of Louisville conducted performances for high school students in three Kentucky counties at a cost of $139,000;

* And in Massachusetts, a project called "The Berkshire Regional Educational Theater" had similar kinds of objectives in Berkshire County on a budget of $282,000.

In virtually all these projects -- and similar ones in the other single or combined arts categories -- performances were augmented by a variety of supplemental activities: usually materials were prepared for both students and teachers; special training sessions for teachers were often conducted; and actors and other

company members went into classrooms whenever possible to discuss, to demonstrate and to engage students directly in dramatic work.

Two of the most interesting projects in theatre dealt with the problem of teacher training. In New Hampshire, "Project TRY" (for "Theatre Resources for Youth") conducted a three-year $253,000 program throughout the state, combining tours of children's theatre plays to elementary schools with a series of seminars, workshops, and in-service training sessions for elementary teachers on the concept of creative dramatics -- both as an imaginative form of dramatic play and as a valuable teaching technique in general classroom situations. Another was a project, in Paintsville, Kentucky, entitled "The Communicative Arts Demonstration Training Project," whose aim was "to train more qualified speech-drama teachers and update the training of those presently teaching and directing these activities in regional secondary schools." Both teachers and students from schools in 20 counties in Eastern Kentucky took part in a six-week theatre-speech workshop and then returned to their home schools "to help implement local programs." This program was funded at $100,000.

Combinations of the Arts

The Combinations-of-the-Arts category is perhaps the most interesting of all because it includes the larger performance programs in which students are exposed to several art forms in a series of performing arts events, as well as the non-performance programs in which both the creative and the performing arts were frequently involved in actual classroom situations in an inter-disciplinary

fashion.

In this category, six states spent in excess of $1 million (Arkansas, California, Illinois, New York, North Carolina, and Ohio). New York State alone spent $2.9 million on a total of 10 separate projects; North Carolina spent $1.8 million on 13 projects. Eight more states spent over $750,000 on a total of 34 projects. Thus, it appears that 10 states were responsible for 57 of the 123 projects listed in this category; the other 66 projects were scattered among the remaining 41 states.

Only 11 states failed to sponsor a single project in the Combined Arts -- and they are states worth a second glance: Alaska, Hawaii, Iowa, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont and Wyoming. It doesn't take long to sense the common denominators among these eleven states: mainly rural, culturally isolated, sparsely-populated, and with few (and certainly no major) arts institutions within their borders. It is clear that these are difficult barriers for educators to surmount in designing innovative programs in the arts, especially those which are geared to student attendance at performing arts events of substantial quality. On the other hand, as attested by imaginative projects of this nature in some of the other culturally isolated states, the barriers are not completely insurmountable.

As may be expected, these Combinations-of-the-Arts Projects ranged from very small planning grants to extremely large operational grants extending over the full three-year period of federal support. The smallest is a $1,251

Planning grant to the Tulsa, Oklahoma schools to plan for "a center to provide all children enriching experiences in the fine and performing arts." (There is no indication that this ever became an operational reality.) In Michigan a $23,714 grant was awarded to the Bellaire Public Schools to plan a new Humanities Curriculum (art, music and literature) for "students in a culturally deprived and isolated area." The proposal states that "A committee of educators and art, music and literature specialists will establish curriculum objectives, methods, materials and procedures [to be] tested in a pilot program which will be the model for the humanities program in all the district schools."
(I checked on this project by phone recently and the new superintendent told me that it had resulted in a 10th grade elective course in "The Humanities" taught by an interdisciplinary team. It is apparently popular, but they are having difficulty figuring out how to evaluate students' progress, the superintendent said.)

One of the largest Combined Arts Projects in a sparsely-populated state was an Operational Project in Madison, Kansas to support a "Cooperative Program for the Cultural Enrichment of Students in Isolated Rural Communities in Kansas." This project provided "supplementary services in music, art and drama to some 8500 students (plus some 16,000 "adult education students") in a 7-county area. The program included:

> "...lectures, demonstrations, and productions by the music faculty of Kansas State Teachers College and visiting artists; a mobile art unit and related art services including lectures by a noted artist; a mobile music unit for supervised listening, and the employment of a composer who would visit schools and create music to be performed by the students; demonstrations and discussions of the dramatic arts (acting, directing, painting) and drama performances."

Over a three-year period this program received $433,000 in Title III support. One could quarrel, perhaps, with the limited scope of some of the components, but the project developers clearly involved "persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served" and put them to work in the actual operation of the project. It would appear to be, without question, "an approach new to the area introducing it" and one which relied, not on established arts institutions, but on a local teachers college and on the infusion of visiting artists.

In Connecticut, the New Haven schools served as the applicant district for six elementary schools (K - 8) scattered throughout the state in the establishment of "Project CREATE," a $455,000 multi-year "arts program with emphasis on the dramatic arts." During the first semester, the program included in-service workshops for teachers, plus the presentation of "three professional productions in each of the schools, one of them an original work commissioned specifically for the project." During the second semester, student creativity was encouraged and students were motivated to plan and present original projects and programs in several different art forms.

I have realized belatedly that the meeting of representatives of Title III arts projects, sponsored by the Foundation in May,* was heavily weighted in favor of projects in the Combinations-of-the-Arts category. Ten out of the sixteen projects represented at this meeting were in this category -- including Connecticut's Project CREATE (mentioned above), Green Bay's Operation Area Arts

* See attached list of Title III representatives, page 148.

Program, Dayton's Living Arts Program, the Arkansas Valley Cultural Enrichment Project, New Jersey's Classroom Renaissance, Washington State's Cultural Enrichment Program, Colorado Springs' Arts and Humanities Education Program, The Huntington (New York) PACE Project (PACE, in this instance, standing for "Performing Arts Curriculum Enrichment"), the teacher workshop project of Pennsylvania's Related Arts Program, and the St. Louis-based MECA Project which, as a "Metropolitan Educational Center in the Arts," served schools in both Illinois and Missouri.

I had not actually planned the participant representation from this standpoint, but in retrospect I am led to confess that my own biases and predelictions certainly seemed to be showing in this instance. My selections were made primarily on the basis of "representativeness". I wanted to obtain the collective insights from as wide a variety of Title III arts projects as I could -- choosing them largely from among projects I had become familiar with over the last few years and had found particularly interesting; I was not looking particularly for "successful" projects although, if the term is not confined simply to continuation on non-federal money, I suspect a majority of the sixteen projects could be regarded as successful "models" of ways in which teaching and learning about the arts might be approached in educational situations. My obvious interest in an integrated approach to arts education -- elaborated on more fully in the article I wrote for a recent issue of Cultural Affairs -- admittedly seems to have expressed itself unconsciously in this selection; but within the meaning of the term, "Combinations of the Arts,"

I think, there is a wide latitude among the kinds of approaches taken by these projects.

Some stressed exposure to performing arts events (the Washington State Cultural Enrichment Project, most strongly, but also Huntington's PACE Project, Project CREATE and the Arkansas project); others stressed a process-oriented approach -- the direct involvement of students in a variety of arts experiences, as creators and performers (the Living Arts Program, the Green Bay Area Arts Program, and Classroom Renaissance); teacher workshops were the major thrust of the Pennsylvania Related Arts Program (at least that part supported by Title III) and to a lesser degree by some of the projects already noted above; Project CREATE, MECA, Area Arts, Huntington PACE, among others, also sought steadily to bring creative and artistic people directly into the classroom or at least into situations with students where confrontation and interraction was possible. Some were curriculum development oriented, at least in part, including the Colorado Springs program, Classroom Renaissance, and the Related Arts project. And finally, the projects ranged from statewide activities (the Washington, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania projects) through regional approaches (the Arkansas project) and a metropolitan area arts service center (MECA) to projects in a single school system. The common denominator in all of them, however, was that they were not working with a single art form; instead, they were trying out different combinations of art forms, in different educational environments, and running the gamut in terms of the teaching and learning strategies they employed.

The full list of projects with brief descriptions of each will be attached to this report, and further observations about the May meeting and the insights it afforded will be made in a later section.

General Projects that Include the Arts

When it comes to the category concerned with "General Projects that Include the Arts," the distinctions are more difficult to make, mainly because -- as we've seen -- the projects themselves are apt to be going in several directions at once and are therefore much more complex. Many embrace a variety of purposes, deal with a range of subject matter fields, and are engaged simultaniously in a series of often unrelated educational functions. A majority of the 168 projects listed on the summary table on page 47A are probably "centers" of some kind, as I pointed out earlier. But not all of them; those that are not are apt to be concerned with some kind of interdisciplinary humanities endeavor -- perhaps a summer program like the "Summer Humanities Orientation Program" in Radford, Virginia, where the emphasis in a six-week program for pre-eighth graders is on "creativity, written and oral expression, art, music appreciation, cultural resources, social sciences, and perhaps even mathematics and reading which can lend themselves to such creative expression." Or other non-center projects might be on the order of that in the Gunnison Watershed School District in Colorado, entitled "Proper Use of Student Transportation Time." Whatever one may think of the title (wondering how it fits as an arts project), this particular project has shown some genuine imagination in planning for better utilization of

"the half-hour to two hours per day which students spend traveling to and from school on buses." An advisory committee supervised the development of curriculum guides and the determination of the proper media for a program on the bus that offered such things as "cultural enrichment, recreation, the development of specified skills, and the acquisition of useful information." A pilot program was conducted during the year in literature (consisting of records and tapes of Mark Twain stories, Shakespearean plays, poetic patterns, words and music, drama and poetry) and music (in which programs such as "the man and his music, theatre of music, adventures in music, folksongs and footnotes" were presented in records and tapes).

With respect to the base statistics, the table reveals a rather surprising fact: namely, that thirteen states spent in excess of a million dollars each on 91 GPIA projects; these expenditures totaled nearly $28 million, which means that about 70 percent of the GPIA money was spent on 54 percent of the projects.

One state – Pennsylvania -- spent about $4 million on 10 projects. Three more states -- Tennessee, Ohio and New York -- spent a total of about $10.6 million on 34 projects. And a fifth state, California, spent $2.6 million on 6 projects. Thus, five of the wealthiest states (excepting Tennessee, I suppose) spent $17.2 million on 50 GPIA projects -- and this means that nearly 44$ of the money supported about a third of the projects.

Tennessee, it appears spent all but $237,000 of its total Title III arts money, amounting to $3.4 million, on four GPIA projects. Only ten states failed to mount

GPIA projects and, in some respects, the list is surprising: Delaware, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Wyoming and the District of Columbia. In many respects (except for D.C. and perhaps Delaware) these are states which, once again, fall into the sparsely-populated, rural, and culturally isolated category. Five (Iowa, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont and Wyoming) were also on the earlier list of states which failed to mount a single Combinations-of-the-Arts project.

The surprising thing about the list of states with no GPIA projects is that the concept of the regional cultural enrichment or resources center was one of Title III's major lures -- a concept almost tailor-made for states with these essentially rural characteristics. Indeed, many states with similar characteristics did develop projects of this kind related to the arts, as I have tried to make clear throughout this report. But, curiously, these eight to ten states did not, and it would be interesting to know what made certain states run the concept into the ground, almost, while others seem to have ignored it completely.

State-by-State Totals

The Totals Column of this summary table on page 47A presents some intriguing gross data as well. Without respect to art form categories, now, but simply in terms of numbers of projects and money expended on them, it appears that twenty-eight of the 51 states (including D.C.) spent in excess of one million dollars on Title III arts projects.

The range is from South Dakota's $2,100 to New York's $7.4 million. While every state is represented by at least one project, there are eight states which supported only one project: Alaska (a general project); Vermont (a music project); South Dakota (visual arts); North Dakota (a general project); Nevada (a combined arts project); Nebraska (combined arts); Hawaii (a general project); and the District of Columbia (a combined arts project).*

On the following page I have listed, in rank order, the top 15 states according to the total amount each expended on arts projects. In addition, so it can be rather quickly seen what the major expenditure categories were for each state, I have added a comment in parentheses giving this breakdown. It would seem from this table that these top 15 states spent $51 million on 210 projects -- or about 65% of the money on 53% of the projects.

* The District of Columbia, as the page 47A footnote indicates, did not provide project data for 1969 and 1970, so undoubtedly it mounted more than the single project noted here.

Title III:

The Top 15 States Ranked According to Total Arts Project Expenditures

(millions of dollars)

States by Rank	Total Arts Funding	Number of Projects	Major Breakdowns
1. New York	7.4 Million	33	(16 GPs @ $3.7; 10 CAs @ $2.9; 5 Music @ $468,000)
2. California	6.04	19	(6 GPs @ $2.6; 5 CAs @ $1.2; 4 Theatre @ $1.4)
3. Pennsylvania	5.3	23	(10 GPs @ $4.04; 9 CAs @ $922,000)
4. Ohio	4.8	22	(14 GPs @ $3.7; 4 CAs @ $1.04)
5. Tennessee	3.4	6	(4 GPs @ $3.1; 2 Music @ $235,000)
6. North Carolina	3.1	24	(13 CAs @ $1.8; 8 GPs @ $1.09)
7. New Jersey	2.9	13	(5 GPs @ $1.5 (50%); 2 CAs @ $905,215)
8. Illinois	2.8	13	(6 GPs @ $1.18; 7 CAs @ $1.69)
9. Texas	2.56	12	(3 Music @ $1.25; 7 GPs @ $948,000)
10. Louisiana	2.4	6	(4 GPs @ $841,000; Lab Theatre @ $1.2)
11. Washington	2.3	8	(2 GPs @ $1.4; Music - $586,000)
12. Virginia	2.26	7	(4 GPs @ $1.5; Bal. split among music, theatre, & CA)
13. Massachusetts	2.1	12	(5 GPs @ $828,000; 4 CAs @ $861,000)
14. Florida	2.0	12	(5 GPs @ $525,000; 3 CAs @ $915,000)
15. Colorado	1.9	13	(9 GPs @ $953,000; 2 Vis. Arts @ $529,000)
	$51.0 Million	210 Projects	

Analysis of Projects by Educational Function

I want, now, to present a different kind of analysis, one that attempts to classify each of the Title III arts projects by its principal educational function. The tentative result of this exercise is the seventeen separate groups of projects listed on the following two pages.

This classification is necessarily somewhat arbitrary. Except in those instances in which I had first-hand knowledge about a project, I based my decisions about placement of projects in specific groups on information found in project abstracts and proposal descriptions. Thus it is a classification concerned essentially with intention rather than with actual accomplishment, and it relies almost exclusively on what people said they were going to do rather than on what they actually did. Furthermore, the project descriptions available to me were often sketchy and, at times, even contradictory. In spite of this, however, I felt the classification by function was worth attempting because it helps to illuminate the variety of ways in which schoolmen (often in conjunction with artistic organizations and advisors) tried to use Title III to improve arts and humanities education during this period. Moreover, it suggests the impressive range of approaches that were undertaken to attack different parts of the problem and take advantage of the different access points within the educational enterprise.

A second point about this grouping of projects is that the category to which each was assigned represents what seemed to me to be the major thrust or emphasis

370 TITLE III ARTS PROJECTS CLASSIFIED

BY PRINCIPAL EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION*

(A Tentative Classification)

	OP	P	Total
1.) General Projects that include the Arts and aimed mainly at establishing a Resource Center (for curriculum development, instructional materials, teacher workshops, or joint support of resource personnel, etc.)	36	29	65
2.) Development of Local, Area or Regional Cultural Centers (for fine or performing arts or for cultural activities generally -- one was a film study center; another stressed the Cherokee cultural arts; several stressed the humanities or the arts of other cultures, such as Asia, Latin America, etc.)	25	19	44
3.) Primarily Curriculum Enrichment Activities in music, art, drama, dance, or film. (Most were combined-arts programs; one used an artmobile to reach 35 schools; several involved teacher workshops.)	32	4	36
4.) Primarily the exposure of students to Performing Arts Events (both in school settings and away from school).	27	6	33
5.) Programs Emphasizing New Instructional Methods in Various Art Forms (four of these used TV or media).	21	3	24
6.) Summer Workshops or Institutes in the Arts (several for disadvantaged youngsters -- one a street theatre workshop; several involved humanities enrichment; and three involved talented kids)	20	3	23
7.) Multi-Functional Performance Programs (combining the following elements: exposure to performances; artists as classroom resource people; in-service teacher workshops and student workshops; new curriculum materials)	20	0	20
8.) Curriculum Enrichment Activities -- geared to serving students in rural or sparsely-settled areas (some utilized mobile units; several used traveling teams of artists or teachers; and some toured performing groups)	15	4	19

* Ranked in order of the total number of programs

	OP	P	Total
9.) Primarily Programs for Talented or Gifted Children (three were summer workshops; one was in crafts; several involved teacher training as well)	13	1	14
10.) Mainly Cultural Enrichment Programs (related usually to disadvantaged kids; several used taped TV programs stressing the arts to enrich curriculum offerings)	9	6	15
11.) Interdisciplinary Humanities (including General Projects of a humanistic nature)	9	2	11
12.) Essentially Curriculum Development in the Arts	8	6	14
13.) Primarily In-Service Teacher Training Programs (one is a Kodaly training project)	6	2	8
14.) Experimental School Programs (in which the arts and/or creativity are of central concern)	5	1	6
15.) Essentially Programs supporting Artists-in-Residence for long periods of time, and usually serving a group of schools (i.e., Green Bay's Area Arts)	3	0	3
16.) Essentially Programs involving intermittent use of Artists in Classroom situations	2	2	4
17.) Planning Grants (covering most of the above categories) which led to operational Projects	-	31	31
TOTALS	251	119	370

of the project. My observations about specific projects up to this point make it obvious that many of these Title III arts projects combine several kinds of services and activities within the same project and often perform more than one educational function. Therefore, arbitrary placement of a project in the "Summer Workshop" category, for example, does not necessarily mean that it may not also have served a "Curriculum Enrichment" function. Such placement simply reflects my personal sense of what the principal function or characteristic of the project appeared to be.

Finally, I should point out that this analysis was applied to only 370 of the 393 projects screened into the survey. The other 23 projects were either newly-initiated during the past two years or projects that had somehow been overlooked when the U.S.O.E. and CEMREL lists were originally drawn up. They were projects which came to our attention only recently when the State Title III Coordinators returned our survey forms. Only basic expenditures and continuation data was provided -- and I simply did not have enough additional information to subject these projects to this kind of classification.

Undoubtedly, if I had had the time to assemble and read each of the proposal documents completely, or to questionnaire each project separately, it might have been possible to make more discrete refinements in this classification list or possibly to condense it somehow. As it is, 17 separate categories are included, and they have been arranged in rank order based on the total number of projects in each group, from the most to the least.

Actually, there are few surprises in this classification, but several significant points about Title III and the arts are more clearly discernible from it -- the way, for example, in which the "supplementary center" concept was developed with respect to arts education. Obviously, the establishment of "centers" was regarded as a major educational instrumentality whether their function was to serve broadly cultural purposes (involving the arts centrally) or to provide more of the specialized educational resources which area schools seemed to need. In the second instance, the arts were somewhat less peripheral than usual, but they were not central to the center's purpose. In whatever fashion these two kinds of centers may ultimately have manifested their arts concerns, there is little doubt that those concerns enjoyed greater status in the area's participating schools than ever before. Were the first two categories of the classification list to be combined, therefore, it would seem that 109 projects -- 61 Operational and 48 Planning -- were essentially geared to this broad educational service function. This is over one-fourth of all the arts projects funded these past five years.

One of the more intriguing aspects of this combined group of 109 "center projects" is the extremely high proportion of Planning Grants awarded. It was common practice during the early days of Title III for a Planning Project to lead rather directly to an Operational Project, which seems only sensible, after all, if the planning activities should result in a really sound idea that can't be financed locally. In this instance, however, it appears that the 48 grants awarded to plan cultural or educational resource centers never led to anything -- to

anything, that is, which appears subsequently to have received federal support. I can state this flatly because all the Planning Grants that did lead to an Operational Project -- there were 31 of them -- are listed separately under Item 17 on the classification list. To be sure, some of these projects -- perhaps eight or ten -- led to Operational Projects involving Centers, but 48 others did not.

This doesn't necessarily mean that operational centers were not established under, or as a result of, these 48 planning projects. Many were sizeable grants indeed and they might well have included a pilot project to test the feasibility of a Center concept.

My own feeling is that many of these 48 projects actually did result in a proposal for an Operational Project, but that the Title III program people at U.S.O.E. and/or the state agency people decided it should not be supported for some reason. There were probably far more proposals to establish regional and area cultural centers than could ever be funded on the available money. Furthermore, the practice in some states, of which California is the most striking example, was literally to blanket the state with service centers, spotting them strategically throughout the area. Many may have seemed worthwhile, even urgent, when the planning proposal was written but were found later to be unnecessary, in all probability. Regardless of this, however, it is obvious that the idea of regional and area centers which served arts and cultural purposes received a high degree of receptivity among the planners and grant-makers during Title III's early years.

*

The Curriculum Enrichment category (No. 3) is composed of a group of 36 projects

(of which only four were established under planning grants) that are essentially concerned with engaging the student directly in arts experiences, or augmenting his classroom environment with arts or arts-related activities on a regularly scheduled basis. It is a category established to distinguish between curriculum activities in which the student is an active participant in an arts experience and those in which the student is largely passive -- as when he is attending a performance in, or away from, the school (Category 4, which we'll get to in a moment). Many of the projects in this group deal with some combination of art forms. Some made use of experimental teaching techniques (improvisation, movement work, film-making experiences) and several were aimed at preparing teachers to work more effectively as facilitators of enrichment experiences in the arts. One, as noted, used an art-mobile and a team of specialists to reach students in a consortium of 35 schools.

The element common to most of these projects is that they were less concerned with contracting for services, for a limited period of time, from outside the system than they were with developing the potential of the regular faculty to do a more effective job of teaching over a sustained period of time. Thus, these projects were apt to have concentrated on the development of potentially useful practices and processes and to have experimented therefore with new curriculum units, with new interdisciplinary ways of working together, with new scheduling arrangements, new teaching techniques, new learning environments, and with the development of new instructional materials and activities.

These are also characteristics common to projects in some of the other categories, those otherwise distinguished by their emphasis on a particular approach or technique or method. Among them are the projects included in the "Interdisciplinary Humanities" category, in that concerned with "Curriculum Development in the Arts," with "In-Service Teacher Training Programs," with "Experimental School Programs," and possibly with those projects in the category labeled "Programs Emphasizing New Instructional Methods." And they obviously apply to Category 8, which is also concerned with "Curriculum Enrichment" but in this instance identifies separately those projects that were conducted specifically in rural or sparsely-populated areas.

Taken together, this is a group of 118 projects, 96 of them supported by Operational (as opposed to Planning) grants. It involves nearly 40% of the 251 Operational Projects included in this classification exercise. Although we have not calculated the exact costs for all the categories involved, I would not be surprised if this group of projects involved expenditures reaching $20 million in all -- which is to say, about a quarter of the total money expended on the arts.

It seems to me that a project of this nature may have produced fundamental educational changes in its sponsoring school whether or not it continued as an identifiable "project" beyond the period of federal support. Because it was more moderate in cost, did not -- as noted -- depend heavily on outside or contracted services, and worked to develop new teaching and learning practices with long-term utility, a project of this kind tended to be more readily absorbed by and retained

within the regular school program after "the project," as such, had officially ended. Since the costs were not horrendous, the expense involved could be incorporated into the district's annual budgetary increases without severe financial dislocation or undue public fanfare. I suspect this has indeed been the case with many of these 118 projects concerned generally with program development rather than a set of specific services.

*

Next, from the parenthetical comments appearing on the classification list, it will be immediately apparent that a great many Title III arts projects included in-service training activities for teachers, in addition to those 8 projects whose central purpose was specifically that. Workshops for teachers were listed among the activities in a number of the projects concerned with "Programs for Talented or Gifted Children," with the "Curriculum Enrichment" projects, the programs listed as "Multi-Functional Performance Programs," and with some of the GPIA-type projects that established resource centers. Obviously, one of the tremendous benefits of a highly flexible, non-categorical federal program like Title III was the opportunity it provided for schools to plan projects that were oriented toward staff development and better teaching strategies whenever this was regarded as more urgent than simply contracting for additional outside services aimed exclusively at the students. Moreover, it also permitted schools to design a child-oriented project and then to include, as an essential part of that project, a range of activities to upgrade teacher competence in the relevant instructional fields. (A good example of this is found in New Hampshire's "Project TRY,"

which contracted for professional tours of children's plays throughout the state but placed equally heavy stress of a series of teacher workshops in creative dramatics.)

*

Another category of project which seems to have engendered more than casual interest is that involving the Summer Workshop principle -- that is, making it possible for a limited group of students to immerse themselves in the arts (and sometimes the humanistic studies generally) for a concentrated period of time in the summer, frequently in locations away from the formal academic-year institutions. In a sense, these projects could also be identified as "enrichment" activities, since enrichment is a word that often seems to be applied to almost everything a school does that is above and beyond the standard program or which (to give it a Title III tie-in) "supplements" the regular curriculum offerings.

What distinguishes the "Summer Workshop" and other special projects of this type from those curriculum enrichment projects discussed a moment ago is, first, that they were generally instituted for a limited period of time and, second, that they were frequently aimed at a particular group of children with special abilities or educational characteristics. Such projects could have been aimed at talented students, at disadvantaged students, at under-achievers perhaps, or -- in their most common form -- at a selected group of students from a cohesive grade-level segment. So it would probably be appropriate to include the 14 "Programs for Talented Children" and the 15 "Cultural Enrichment Programs" in this general group of special purpose enrichment projects.

The "Talented Children" category is largely self-explanatory, but the group

of projects listed as "Cultural Enrichment Programs" needs a word of explanation. "Cultural Enrichment" (as distinguished from "curriculum enrichment") is the euphemism frequently applied to programs directed toward children who, in one way or another, have been deprived of the cultural benefits of middle-class America. It usually means that the children are from non-white ethnic backgrounds and that their deprivation is linked directly to their upbringing in a culture of poverty. The term has had far greater currency with ESEA Title I planners, administrators and program officers where it has been virtually institutionalized by according it the status of an official instructional category.

There seems to have been considerably less "cultural chauvinism" in Title III, however, than in Title I programs. Nevertheless, I suspect that elements of the practice existed in some Title III projects as well, particularly those which -- in the process of bringing "culture" to these youngsters or them to it -- tended to ignore or condescend to their culturally-different heritage. Because of this attitude, one tends to assume that whenever the term "cultural Enrichment" is used it is a kind of code word for a project or a program concerned with non-white children, and primarily Negro children.

Surprisingly, however, many of these Title III projects were concerned with white youngsters living in depressed areas of the country, and more often than not they were located in those sparsely-populated rural states I mentioned earlier, in which few cultural institutions or advantages of any kind can be found -- middle-class or otherwise. Even libraries are few and far between in some of

these regions.

Thus, in seeking innovative educational approaches, schoolmen in these states frequently took the cultural enrichment route, either straight-forwardly by broadening curriculum offerings in their own schools or (as we've seen) by seeking culture in the more complicated context of the regional or area-wide cultural center. The 15 projects in Category 10 were mainly of the simpler kind, undertaken by single school districts or by only a handful, and without formally establishing any kind of central coordinating agency like a center. As noted in the parenthetical comment, several of these projects utilized videotaped programs as curriculum enrichment elements.

*

Another interesting category to examine briefly is that concerned with "New Instructional Methods in Various Art Forms." Actually, these 24 projects cluster heavily in two major groupings. One is concerned with a variety of methods for innovative utilization of the new educational technology (film television, video-tape and audio-tapes). The other covers a score of projects in which new instructional approaches to the teaching of music were undertaken. They ranged from work with the Orff Method (sometimes in collaboration with Schulwerk), to experimental string instruction (including two Suzuki Method projects); from ensemble performance training to electronic music composition; from "keyboard experiences" as a basis for teaching music in the early grades to music therapy for handicapped students and a project to teach "Music Appreciation Through Television and Multi-Sensory Reenforcement Techniques." If not "new," most of

these methods were at least innovative to the area introducing them.

Among other miscellaneous projects in this "new techniques" category is one in Hood River, Oregon, concerned with "experimentation in the use of art as an educational device in improving learning and teaching"; a project aimed at initiating flexible scheduling in a Maryland high school "to allow greater curricular emphasis on the arts;" the EPOCH Project in Berkeley, California, in which a large circumferential screen surrounding the student audience was used for multi-media projection of cultural heritage subjects; and the Colorado project already noted that was experimenting with media techniques in school busses to see whether transportation time could be utilized for educational pruposes.

*

One of the more common ways in which the schools involved themselves with the arts was, of course, to utilize the services of professional performing arts organizations. This attempt to expose students to the performance experience was undertaken either by transporting them to events away from the school environment (usually to the facilities of a resident performing group in the area) or by contracting with performing groups to come to the schools with tours of major works or with special productions that were tailored to serve a particular educational purpose.

In about 33 projects, as nearly as I can tell, this approach was undertaken on precisely those terms, with little attempt to go beyond the performance itself -- except perhaps to prepare background materials for teachers and students. For

the most part, too, when theatre companies were involved, the student audience was apt to be mainly high school students unless something special had been created for younger students. When orchestral, choral or small ensemble groups were involved, the elementary or middle grades seemed more frequently to make up the intended audience. Dance or regional ballet companies seemed to perform for students at all educational levels, depending on the nature of the project.

A more sophisticated and comprehensive approach to the performance-oriented program was undertaken by perhaps 20 projects which I have grouped under a heading called "Multi-Functional Performance Programs." My intention here was to identify projects which did not simply serve up performances on a kind of hit-and-run basis but attempted instead to augment the performance with a whole range of complementary activities. In such projects, members of the performing group were regularly engaged in non-production activities of an instructional, demonstrational, or advisory type. They conducted workshops for students and teachers, held special seminars for gifted students or perhaps technically-motivated students, worked individually in classroom situations lecturing, demonstrating, leading discussions or doing readings, and on occasion they even served as advisors to student productions and performances. In addition, they frequently worked with teachers or curriculum-building faculty teams to develop new instructional materials or teaching strategies.

Some of these projects, moreover, frequently went beyond the local performing groups to obtain advisory and leadership services, bringing in nationally-recognized

artists and authorities to assist with certain aspects of the program. The Educational Laboratory Theatre Projects in Rhode Isiand, New Orleans and Los Angeles were of this genre, as were the Roberson Center project in Binghampton, the Seattle music and opera projects, the MECA project and New Jersey's Classroom Renaissance, among others.

*

To give another dimension to this breakdown by educational function, I have taken the top seven categories in the classification list and -- on the following page -- listed them again, this time with a column showing roughly the amount of money spent on each. It shows that nearly $53 million was spent on the 245 projects in these seven major categories. This means that two-thirds of the 370 projects included in the classification received about 70% of the money.

Several points of interest are raised by a closer look at these figures, however. First, the two groups of projects relating to the establishment of both resource centers and cultural centers add up to a total of 109 projects on which about $24.5 million of Title III money was spent. This is easily the largest category of projects devoted to a roughly similar educational function.

A second group of related categories concerns those oriented toward a performance function for the schools. The two categories that fit this general description are those listed as "Performing Arts Events" and "Multi-Functional Performance Programs." Together these two categories form a group of 53 projects on which about $15.5 million was spent during Title III's first five years. It is this $15.5 million -- 20% of the total, incidentally -- which suggested to me the point I

Title III: Expenditures for the Top Seven Groups of Arts Projects

Classified by Educational Function

(Ranked According to Funding Level)

Category	Numbers (OP)	(P)	TOTAL		Expenditures, 1966-70	
1) GPIA projects aimed at Establishing a Resource Center	36	29	65		$16,657,844	$24.5 Million
2) Multi-Functional Performance Programs	20	0	20		$ 9,138,142	
3) Development of Cultural Centers	25	19	44		$ 7,823,000	
4) Curriculum Enrichment Activities	32	4	36	$15.5 Million	$ 7,334,196	
5) Performing Arts Events (in the schools and elsewhere)	27	6	33		$ 6,366,583	
6) New Instructional Methods in the Arts	21	3	24		$ 2,991,678	
7) Summer Workshops	20	3	23		$ 2,634,349	
TOTALS:	181	64	245		$52,945,799	

raised at the very beginning of this report: namely, that ESEA appears to have done more to keep America's performing arts organizations in business than any other single piece of government legislation in history.

I am sure that the other ten categories on the classification list (pages 67 and 68) include projects supporting performing arts groups to the tune of at least another $5 million -- and the resulting $20 million or so does not even come close to what was apparently spent under Title I these past five years to expose disadvantaged children to performing arts events. It's a sobering thought, from whatever standpoint you look at it.

*

Finally, I want to arrange these classifications in a way to provide yet another perspective on the data. Roughly, it looks as follows:

Types of Projects	Numbers of Projects OP	P	TOTAL	Expenditures
Group I - High Cost Projects (i.e. centers and performing arts)	108	54	162	$40.0 Million
Group II - Moderate Cost Projects (primarily curriculum enrichment)	96	22	118	an estimated $20-24 Million
Group III - Other Miscellaneous "Project-type" activities (Summer Workshops, etc.)	47	12	58	an estimated $12-16 Million
Group IV - Planning Grants that led to Operational Projects	—	31	31	an estimated $4 Million
	251	119	370	$70-80 Million

What this suggests is that about $40 million -- roughly half the entire Title III outlay for the arts -- was spent on 162 projects which were relatively high-cost operations supporting either Center or Performing Arts activities of some kind. In addition to being high-cost, these projects are also characterized by the fact that they are fundamentally "service" projects and that they therefore acquire a kind of independent life of their own, as projects. Their survival, then, usually depends on the ability of the project people involved to find new resources outside the regular school system (or systems) to keep the program in existence and, by extension, to effect anv continuing educational payoff. Few if any such operations have found outside resources of this order available, and therefore, when federal support has been terminated, the project has either died out completely or been so drastically curtailed that it could hardly be regarded as the same operation at all. Thus only those kids touched by it when it functioned as "a project" will have truly benefited from it.

The only other way for succeeding generations of students to benefit from such a project seems to be for a consortium of participating schools to chip in a pro rata share of the overall costs -- because most individual districts simply cannot provide the necessary funds alone under present tax revenue arrangements. There are instances, fortunately, where consortium support has materialized -- frequently with modest additional subsidy from the state -- to continue such projects. Examples are the Huntington PACE Project and the Rhode Island Laboratory Theatre Project.

The second major group of projects is the Curriculum Enrichment type

mentioned earlier -- projects of moderate cost which, if they do indeed result in better teaching and learning practices, "innovative" instructional materials and methods, and in imaginative administrative arrangements (i.e. flexible scheduling, independent study programs, etc.), can be given a new life of their own apart from the "project" concept. To be sure, some projects of this type do not fall conveniently into such a ready-made survival cubbyhole. I think, for instance, of Dayton's Living Arts Program which rennovated an old warehouse, installed a team of artist-teachers (some as full-time directors, more as part-time teachers), and operated an arts workshop for hundreds of students mainly during out-of-school hours -- afternoons and nights, weekends, summers, etc. This was clearly an enrichment project, and it could apparently only continue as a project for some kids, for limited time periods, and for supplementary enrichment purposes. An operating levy, which included about $100,000 to continue the Living Arts Program, failed in early May for the third time in a period of months -- and the project seems therefore to be finished.

This rather striking example to the contrary notwithstanding, it seems to me that the projects in Group II of my modified list really have the best chance of achieving a long-term educational pay-off because, in more instances than not, they have resulted in things that the system can continue to use or benefit from beyond the life of the project itself. My estimate of $20-24 million being spent on 118 projects of this kind is truly an educated guess -- but I do think it's close.

Group III, on the other hand, is concerned with the self-contained kinds of projects -- those directed to special groups, such as the talented student or the

deprived student, and engaged in rather specific and delimited enrichment activities such as summer programs, the employment of artists-in-residence or the intermittent use of artists in classroom situations. I suspect that between $12-16 million may have been spent on the 59 projects in this group. The thing that limits the survival potential of these kinds of projects is their extreme specificity, their intentionally limited objectives. They were often experimental (but unfortunately they never learned how to evaluate the results of their experiments well enough to make them generalizable elsewhere); they were often simply one-shot hypos injected into the system to remedy, for a sub-section of students, a particular educational ill (and because they have seldom known how to disseminate the results, no one now knows much about their ability to apply the lessons learned to their on-going program). Thus, while it was probably never their purpose to continue more than a year or two as "projects," they never come to the surface much because -- like the projects in Group II -- their directors aren't around pounding on non-federal doors trying to secure continuation funds. It is possible, therefore, that they, too, have contributed new knowledge and practices to the on-going system, but at the moment it would be difficult to say precisely what.

Group IV, of course, is self-explanatory -- a group of some 31 projects which may have received as much as $4 million (perhaps even more -- the amount given is purely a guess) to engage in a planning activity which ultimately led to a separate Operational Project. As projects, they came into existence, did their job, and were terminated -- but presumably they influenced strongly the

resulting operational projects.

*

This, then, completes the analysis of Title III arts projects in terms of primary educational function. As arbitrary and subjective as my approach to this exercise has been, it has nonetheless enabled me to isolate certain factors about Title III grant-making in the arts which I believe are important for any true understanding of this aspect of the program.

Relative Emphasis by the States on Arts Projects

A third way of looking at the data we have assembled about these projects is to examine what proportion of its Title III allocation each of the states spent on arts projects. The resulting percentages will then enable us to rank the states accordingly.

For this analysis I have used the total amounts spent by the states during the 1966-70 period on Title III arts projects, without regard to art form or educational function. This is simply a repeat of the data found in the "Totals" column on the summary table on page 47A. Against it, however, I have placed a figure which represents the total amount each state was allocated for all Title III purposes during the same 5-year period, according to official U.S.O.E. reports.

In a sense, this may lead to unfair percentages, because the total annual allocation was not the amount actually used by the states for grant-making purposes. The total allocation includes some of the mandated set-asides mentioned earlier --

funds for state administration and, in the last two years, amounts reserved to fund projects specifically benefiting handicapped children. The reader should simply bear in mind that in every instance the percentage of money spent on arts projects would actually be higher if only the unencumbered grant-making allocations had been used. On the other hand, the state-by-state comparisons are not effected and the rankings of the states relative to one another are therefore reliable.

It may be pertinent here to repeat the formula used to determine state Title III allocations. A base allocation of $200,000 was allowed for each state, regardless of size or propulation. Then, to quote official language:

> "One-half of the remainder of the funds appropriated for the title was apportioned to each state on the basis of the ratio of the number of school-age children in that state to the number of such children in all the states; the other half of the available funds was apportioned on the basis of the ratio of the total population in that state to the population of all the states."

In essence, the formula meant that the more heavily populated a state was the more money it received, after the first $200,000. Thus, California got a five-year sum totaling $57,964,320, while Alaska got only $2,164,244.

The table on the following page lists the states alphabetically and shows first, each state's total five year allocation for Title III purposes; second, the amount each state spent on arts projects (as defined in this report); and last, the percentage that amount is of each state's total allocation.

On the second page following is a table which ranks the states (and D.C.) in

Title III: Arts Projects as a Percentage of Each State's Total Allocation

(FY 1966 - 70)

State	Total Allocation	Title III Arts Expenditures	Percent
Alabama	12,240,583	1,462,256	11.9%
Alaska *	2,146,644	306,209	14.2%
Arizona	6,277,866	1,117,820	17.8%
Arkansas	7,181,983	1,781,515	24.8%
California	57,964,320	6,049,746	10.4%
Colorado	7,331,899	1,945,454	26.5%
Connecticut	9,723,631	1,723,459	17.7%
Delaware	2,855,291	333,532	11.6%
District of Columbia *	3,539,807	82,767	2.3%
Florida	18,703,935	2,016,045	10.7%
Georgia *	15,060,772	988,708	6.5%
Hawaii	3,549,898	268,247	7.5%
Idaho	3,495,147	183,520	5.2%
Illinois	33,782,631	2,882,014	8.5%
Indiana *	16,500,348	1,344,353	8.1%
Iowa	9,672,839	441,875	4.5%
Kansas	8,134,238	1,243,143	15.2%
Kentucky	11,032,025	654,356	5.9%
Louisiana	12,738,322	2,475,069	19.4%
Maine	4,261,759	836,476	19.6%
Maryland	12,223,693	856,762	7.0%
Massachusetts	17,225,032	2,159,047	12.5%
Michigan	27,949,399	360,768	1.2%
Minnesota	12,439,608	1,418,626	11.4%
Mississippi	8,719,576	1,369,878	15.7%
Missouri	14,774,703	927,151	6.2%
Montana	3,486,839	671,879	19.2%
Nebraska	5,683,629	40,307	.7%
Nevada	2,581,794	99,937	3.8%
New Hampshire	3,306,261	981,021	29.6%
New Jersey	21,607,003	2,938,244	13.5%
New Mexico	4,607,426	1,229,045	26.6%
New York	54,560,118	7,441,540	13.6%
North Carolina	16,730,481	3,129,369	18.7%
North Dakota	3,326,934	595,140	17.8%
Ohio	33,501,144	4,807,734	14.3%
Oklahoma	8,588,320	1,776,361	20.6%
Oregon	7,162,872	460,686	6.4%
Pennsylvania	36,155,957	5,389,181	14.9%
Rhode Island	3,896,004	1,356,115	34.8%
South Carolina	9,471,526	326,265	3.4%
South Dakota	3,433,593	2,100	.1%
Tennessee	13,030,463	3,403,393	26.1%
Texas	34,913,161	2,556,334	7.3%
Utah	4,577,052	212,248	4.6%
Vermont	2,535,228	11,735	.4%
Virginia	14,898,817	2,268,390	15.2%
Washington	10,502,809	2,343,142	22.3%
West Virginia *	6,819,859	1,010,811	14.8%
Wisconsin	14,152,093	1,007,869	7.1%
Wyoming	2,317,798	109,396	4.7%
TOTALS:	661,373,130	79,397,338	12.0%

* Data on arts expenditures for FY 1969 and 1970 is incomplete and thus could affect percentage.

Title III: The States Ranked According to Percentage of Title III Allocation Spent on Arts Projects (FY 1966 - 1970)

	State	Percentage	Rank by Allocation
(1)	Rhode Island	34.8	39
(2)	New Hampshire	29.6	46
(3)	New Mexico	26.6	36
(4)	Colorado	26.5	30
(5)	Tennessee	26.1	17
(6)	Arkansas	24.8	29
(7)	Washington	22.3	23
(8)	Oklahoma	20.6	28
(9)	Maine	19.6	38
(10)	Louisiana	19.4	18
(11)	Montana	19.2	43
(12)	North Carolina	18.7	11
(13)	North Dakota	17.8	45
(14)	Arizona	17.8	34
(15)	Connecticut	17.7	24
(16)	Mississippi	15.7	27
(17)	Kansas	15.2	29
(18)	Virginia	15.2	14
(19)	Pennsylvania	14.9	3
(20)	West Virginia *	14.8	33
(21)	Ohio	14.3	6
(22)	Alaska*	14.2	51
(23)	New York	13.6	2
(24)	New Jersey	13.5	8
(25)	Massachusetts	12.5	10
(26)	Alabama	11.9	20
(27)	Delaware	11.6	47
(28)	Minnesota	11.4	19
(29)	Florida	10.7	9
(30)	California	10.4	1
(31)	Illinois	8.5	5
(32)	Indiana*	8.1	12
(33)	Hawaii	7.5	40
(34)	Texas	7.3	4
(35)	Wisconsin	7.1	16
(36)	Maryland	7.0	21
(37)	Georgia *	6.5	13
(38)	Oregon	6.4	32
(39)	Missouri	6.2	15
(40)	Kentucky	5.9	22
(41)	Idaho	5.2	42
(42)	Wyoming	4.7	50
(43)	Utah	4.6	37
(44)	Iowa	4.5	25
(45)	Nevada	3.8	48
(46)	South Carolina	3.4	26
(47)	District of Columbia*	2.3	41
(48)	Michigan	1.2	7
(49)	Nebraska	.7	35
(50)	Vermont	.4	49
(51)	South Dakota	.1	44

* Data on arts expenditures for FY 1969 and 1970 is incomplete.

Title III: Top Third of the States

Ranked According to Total Expenditures on Arts Projects

	Arts Expenditure (in millions)	Arts Expenditure as Percent of Total Allocation	Rank by Total Allocation Amount	
			Rank	(in millions)
1. New York	$7.44	13.6%	2	($54.5)
2. California	$6.04	10.4%	1	($57.9)
3. Pennsylvania	$5.38	14.9%	3	($36.1)
4. Ohio	$4.80	14.3%	6	($33.5)
5. Tennessee*	$3.40	26.1%	17	($13.0)
6. North Carolina	$3.12	18.7%	11	($16.7)
7. New Jersey	$2.93	13.5%	8	($21.6)
8. Illinois	$2.88	18.5%	5	($33.7)
9. Texas	$2.55	7.3%	4	($34.9)
10. Louisiana*	$2.47	19.4%	18	($12.7)
11. Washington*	$2.34	22.3%	23	($10.5)
12. Virginia	$2.26	15.2%	14	($14.8)
13. Massachusetts	$2.15	12.5%	10	($17.2)
14. Florida	$2.01	10.7%	9	($18.7)
15. Colorado*	$1.94	26.5%	30	($ 7.3)
16. Arkansas*	$1.78	24.8%	29	($ 7.1)
17. Oklahoma*	$1.77	20.6%	28	($ 8.5)
TOTALS:	$55.26	-	-	($398.7)

* States which appear to have made extra arts effort.

terms of this percentage figure. And finally, on the third page following is a table which presents several kinds of information relative to the top 17 states -- in effect, the top third -- when ranked in terms of amount of money spent on arts projects.

From the information on these three tables, one can begin to sense what the school finance people refer to (in a different context) as effort; which is to say: how much effort, relative to one another, did each of the states make to support projects in the arts? And indeed there are a few surprises when one looks closely at the data.

On the Table on page 89, which ranks the states according to the percentage of Title III money spent on the arts, one is immediately struck by the large number of small, essentially rural, sparsely-populated states that rank in the upper third of the group. Rhode Island, the smallest state, in 39th place on the allocation scale, ranks first -- a result stemming mainly from its support of the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program in what is essentially something of a city-state. Rhode Island only received about $3.9 million overall and it spent $850,000 of that amount on "Project Discovery," as the Laboratory Theatre Project there was called. Once the commitment had been made to involve itself in this large-scale three-year operation (reaching all high school students in the state, incidentally), the die was cast for Rhode Island to spend its Title III money heavily in the arts. The explanation for Louisiana's high rank (10th) can also be attributed to unusually large amounts for the Laboratory Theatre Project in New Orleans, which received about half that state's Title III arts money.

But without attempting to detail how each of the other top states spent their money, it is clear that you have to run down the list to the 19th ranked state, Pennsylvania, to come to a wealthy, relatively industrial and heavily-populated state. Only North Carolina (12th) among states in the top third of this ranking, received a relatively large total allocation. So North Carolina seems to be a state that made what could be regarded as the "expected" effort; on the other hand, it was the only one of the larger, more affluent states to put a substantial amount of its relatively high allocation into projects in the arts -- a point I want to elaborate on in a moment.

The other 15 states in the top third group, with relatively smaller populations and generally far less in the way of cultural resources, apparently decided to make an "exceptional" effort to acquire some of these resources under Title III. There is New Hampshire, for example -- 46th in total allocation, but 2nd in arts projects effort; and New Mexico -- 36th in allocation, but 3rd in arts projects effort; and Montana (respectively 43rd and 11th), North Dakota (45th and 13th), and Arizona (34th and 14th). It is interesting to note that 5 of New Mexico's 7 projects were "General Projects that Include the Arts"; 6 of Montana's 9 were GPIA projects; that 2 of Arizona's 4 were GPIA projects and a third was a large Music Enrichment project; and North Dakota's only arts project was a General Project. So the supposition would be that the relatively high cost cultural centers and resource centers were the favored routes by which states of this kind sought to upgrade themselves in the arts.

The second striking fact that comes out from these tables, particularly the one concerned with percentages, is that virtually all of the wealthier states are clustered in the middle third of the percentage spectrum. Of the 14 top-ranked states according to allocation,11 (excepting only Michigan, North Carolina and Georgia) are found in the middle third of the arts-effort list. Which is to say that these big, relatively affluent, more densely populated and culturally advantaged states which received the most Title III money spent relatively less of it on the arts than many of the less well-off states in "rural America." In another sense, perhaps, they spent what might be regarded as an "average" amount on the arts -- and this may be interpreted to mean, I suppose, that the schools in these wealthier states didn't feel quite so neglectful of the arts as their counterparts in the other states and, therefore, the motivation to "catch up" may not have been as great. On the other hand, several relatively high-cost projects of the resource center variety in these rural, sparsely-populated states seem to have accounted for the high ranking several of them enjoy on the effort spectrum. Where these were GPIA projects in which the arts were only part of a larger effort to upgrade student offerings all across the board, the seemingly exceptional arts-effort of these states would have to be qualified somewhat.

Michigan is a real surprise. Seventh in amount of total allocation, it sits all alone way down at the bottom of the arts-effort scale. Out of a total pot of nearly $28 million, it apparently spent only $360,000 on arts projects. It represents a phenomena I can't account for at all.

North Carolina, on the other hand, ranking moderately high (12th and 11th) on both lists, had some unusual characteristics that might account for the fact that it spent $3.1 million (nearly 20%) of its $16.7 million allocation on arts projects. I'm going to take a moment here to speculate on what some of these factors might have been that brought a total of 24 arts projects into existence there.

The most significant factor, in my judgment, was the establishment of the Learning Institute of North Carolina as a unique educational development center serving schools throughout the state during the early 1960s -- several years prior to the passage of ESEA, as a matter of fact. LINC -- as it was known -- was one of several innovative educational enterprises that flowered in North Carolina under the administration of Governor Terry Sanford, who ran for office with the improvement of education as his major campaign issue. Two other outcomes of this concern were the Governor's School, a special summer education program for gifted students, and the North Carolina School of the Arts, established under public funds as the state's high school of the arts. A highly respected arts training institution, the School of the Arts now offers talented performing arts students a program that extends from junior high school through the college level.

LINC, however, served a different function. The first director of LINC was Harold Howe II who, of course, later became U.S. Commissioner of Education and had, as a major part of that job, primary responsibility for administering the new education act of 1965. Before he left, however, Mr. Howe gathered around him an extraordinary group of bright and talented educational activists who served

as catalysts for a host of imaginative educational programs with extraordinary statewide impact. His successor as LINC director was Gordon McAndrew (now superintendent of schools in Gary, Indiana) who came to LINC as head of its experimental boarding school program for underachieving 8th grade students around the state, a pilot project known as the North Carolina Advancement School and the forerunner of the intriguing Pennsylvania Advancement School now operating in the Philadelphia schools. The Advancement School, among other approaches, lumped most of the creative and performing arts together into a single course in "the communications arts" and placed it centrally in the school's 3-month motivational curriculum.

In addition, however, LINC began increasingly to serve as a major advisor to school systems throughout the state which were in the throes of proposal development for potential Title III projects. LINC's emphasis on arts and humanities education was fundamental -- and it is my very strong hunch that it was chiefly responsible for the fact that North Carolina's total of 24 arts projects was exceeded only by New York (with 33) during these first five years of Title III activity. Equally significant is that only 8 of these projects were of the so-called GPIA type, while 13 involved a combination-of-the-arts approach, and all but three of the state's24 projects were approved during Title III's first two years.

There is, to my knowledge, no other state whose schools had access to the kind of guidance and assistance provided by LINC staff people to proposal developers in the North Carolina schools during these crucial years of Title III. I have no idea what kinds of educational projects were funded with the remaining

80% of North Carolina's money, but I am equally certain that LINC influence was strong on many of them as well. LINC still exists as an institution but, for all intents and purposes, it went out of existence several years ago when powerful figures in the state took it publicly to task as a "tool of the liberal educational establishment." When Gordon McAndrew left in the fall of 1968, most of the top people on the staff left, too, and LINC became an increasingly traditional, uncontroversial arm of the state education agency.

The only other state that stands out somewhat nakedly in terms of its arts effort is Texas. Although only three states received more Title III money than Texas, and only eight states spent more on the arts, Texas' arts expenditure was only 7.3 percent of the total allocation, placing it 34th on the arts - effort scale, at the bottom of the middle third of the states. I know of no unique circumstance that might account for this low ranking.

In the middle bracket of percentage rankings, Alaska seems to have done exceptionally well -- standing last in the allocation total, she spent over 14% of her Title III money on the arts, and stands 22nd on the percentage scale. Delaware, too, apparently did a commendable job -- 47th in allocations, she spent enough on the arts to rank 27th on the percentage scale.

With reference to the last table, on page 90, which ranks the top 17 states according to total expenditures on arts projects (and then provides other related data on each), I want to draw attention to the relative merits of six states.

This group of states, composed of those in the top one-third of the arts projects expenditure scale, spent over $55 million -- slightly less than 75% of

the money spent on the arts under Title III. Of the 17 states on the list, Tennessee seems to have made an extraordinary arts effort -- ranking 17th in allocations it nonetheless spent 26% of its money on arts projects.* Louisiana and Washington, ranking 11th and 23rd in allocations, placed 10th and 11th respectively -- indicating an unusually strong arts effort.

Colorado, Arkansas and Oklahoma (ranking 15th, 16th, and 17th in terms of amounts spent on arts projects) received relatively low total allocations -- ranking 30th, 29th, and 28th respectively. All of them spent more than 20% of their available funds on the arts.

* * *

This concludes the three-way analysis of Title III arts projects. I hope the lengthy discussion of statistical information hasn't been so hard to follow or so labored that it has served to confuse rather than clarify the issues involved. I admit to this possibility -- but saw no way to avoid it and still provide a rounded picture of the issues involved.

---

* Tennessee, however, has the honor of sponsoring the most expensive single arts-related project in the entire Title III experience. It is a "General Project" which, to date, has accounted for $2,273,069 of the state's total arts expenditure of $3,403,393. Called "Project Mid-Term," it was established in 1966 in the Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County Public Schools and is described as follows: "Through a new organizational pattern in the region, the following programs will be developed: demonstration schools, an inservice training center, a school with dual staff, a symphony orchestra program, a children's museum with mobile unit, cultural enrichment programs, a learning resources center, and pupil personnel services."

ARTS PROJECTS AFTER TWO YEARS OF STATE ADMINISTRATION

The last two years of the five-year period covered by this study involved a complicated transition period as the administrative responsibility for the Title III program was transferred from the Office of Education to the state education departments.

This shift was the result of a legislative mandate which had been included in the 1967 Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Amendments were primarily the work of the House of Representatives, and of Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon and Congressman Albert Quie of Minnesota, in particular. As I pointed out earlier in this report, Title III had been the one federal education program of consequence that permitted Office of Education grant-makers to deal directly with local school districts and it was no secret that the educational bureaucracies in the state education agencies resented the freedom this gave to the U.S.O.E. bureaucracy. The states wanted considerably more say in the Title III grant-making process than merely to "review and recommend." In the 1967 Ammendments, they achieved their goal -- and then some.

The pressures ultimately exerted from this quarter of the educational establishment were felt most directly by members of the House of Representatives. These were pressures, moreover, which seemed particularly in accord with the increasingly

conservative views of the Congresswoman from Oregon, Mrs. Green, one of the vigorous champions of educational causes in Congress. From her influential position on the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mrs. Green is said to have placed the weight of her formidable record as a supporter of federal aid to education firmly behind the plan to move Title III out of U.S.O.E. hands and into the waiting arms of the state agencies.

The result was that the Amendments were passed and a new, generally more conservative era of ESEA's Title III was inaugurated.

The Transition Period

Under the new amendments, the state agencies began -- during Fiscal 1969 -- to administer 75% of the appropriated funds, while the Office of Education continued to administer the remaining 25%. Beginning with Fiscal 1970, and continuing thereafter, the states were to have full responsibility for handling all program funds appropriated under Title III.

The transition year, Fiscal 1969, which began July 1, 1968, was a difficult one from virtually all standpoints. The confrontations over the 75% - 25% division of program funds, the pressures exerted by U.S.O.E. to get state officials to continue projects it had originally approved for two- and three-year periods, the newly-mandated use of 15% of Title III grant monies for projects benefiting handicapped children, and the scramble on the part of the state agencies to find new and qualified staff people -- all these things created endless confusion within Title III administrative circles around the country. And they impacted hard on

individual projects, as well.

Two other factors added to the confusion. The first was that Congress cut the Title III appropriations to $164.8 million for Fiscal 1969, a drop of $23 million from the previous year. (There has been speculation that Congressional forces really intend to kill off Title III completely in the long run, and some people therefore viewed the appropriation cut-back for 1969 as the second nail in the coffin, the first being the 1967 amendments, of course. If this viewpoint were accepted, I suppose the third nail might have been the further cut-back in appropriations this last year -- down to $116 million -- and the likelihood that the Fiscal 1971 appropriations will drive in a fourth nail by adding further categorical set-asides without increasing the funding level significantly, if at all. It is an impressive argument, I must say, and one with which I am in substantial agreement.)

Added to all the other problems of that transitional year, the cut of $23 million during 1969 meant that even those projects all parties agreed should be continued were, nonetheless, subjected to across-the-board cuts averaging about 15%. The head-knocking occurred whenever a project task group came in to discuss its continuation request. In many instances these discussions took place at a point in time when nobody knew for certain how much the final cuts would amount to. It need hardly be pointed out that very little effective planning or administrative efficiency could be engendered at the project level under such circumstances.

The second confusing element that year had to do with the Amendment's requirement that each state develop a State Plan "which would set forth a strategy for

assessing the state's educational needs and determining which of these needs were critical,and a strategy for developing a Title III program which would demonstrate ways of meeting those needs," as U.S.O.E.'s Report, Focus on Innovation, stated it. "In addition," the document goes on, "State Plans were to delineate plans and procedures for evaluating Title III projects, desseminating information about the projects, and adopting promising practices developed by the projects."

The Amendments also stipulated that each state would have to establish, within its educational agency, a State Advisory Council whose members were -- in the now-familiar phrase -- "broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the state." In addition, the President was directed to appoint a 12-member National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. (The Council members were duly appointed by President Johnson, but those who believe that the present administration -- as well as Congress -- intends ultimately to let Title III die point to the fact that the four vacancies on this Council which occurred in January, 1969, have not yet been filled by President Nixon.)

So -- in summary -- the state education agencies not only had to start hiring a larger Title III staff, fight with U.S.O.E. officials about what projects to continue on whose money, and make local project people unhappy by cutting back on their anticipated '69 money, they also had to set about developing their State Plans and appointing their new State Advisory Committees.

The State Plans were to be based on "an assessment of the state's critical educational needs," and this, as the U.S.O.E. Report points out, "is virtually a new endeavor for most state educational agencies. To conduct a thorough needs assessment requires staff expertese, funds, and a strategy that will yield valid and reliable data. Heretofore, state agencies have assessed their educational needs in terms of organizational structure, staff arrangements, numbers of teachers and specialists, etc. The current efforts are directed, instead, toward children's individual needs in the cognitive, affective and psycho-motor domains of learning. The results of this type of assessment should provide the state educational agencies with a rationale for funding demonstration projects in areas of behavior relating to knowledge, attitudes and values, as well as to physical and motor skills."

Many of the states, according to this year-end report for 1969, "had not identified their critical educational needs by the end of the fiscal year, but" it adds hopefully, "the State Plans for 1970 indicate improved strategies for this purpose."

How the Arts Fared

With this by way of background, it is appropriate to discuss what effect these new conditions may have had on the support of arts projects during these last two years when the states were assuming full administration of the program.

To sense the overall development, it will be instructive to refer back to the table on page 22. The figures representing annual "Arts Projects Expenditures"

on this table tell the story rather dramatically: from a high of $24 million in fiscal 1968, expenditures for arts projects dropped nearly $10 million the next year -- to $14,516,000 -- and, if the data we have gathered in our survey is even roughly reliable, funding dropped another $8 million during the fiscal year just completed, to $6,066,000. It was noted earlier that, as a percentage of the total Title III appropriations for those years, arts projects funding dropped from 12% in 1968 to 5% in 1970.

Some of this reduction, of course, can be attributed to the normal termination of federal support at the end of the two-year and three-year periods which were characteristic of perhaps half of the 393 arts projects under consideration. The majority of these multi-year projects were approved during the first several years, when U.SO.E. was administering the program. They would therefore have come to an end, with respect to federal support, by the beginning of 1969 and 1970.

Partly, too, this reduction in funding for arts programs was a direct result of the 15% across-the-board cut-back in appropriations Congress voted in 1969 and the even more drastic reduction in 1970. The regression went from $187.8 million to $164.8 million, and then to $116 million within two years. And a third factor that no doubt influenced spending for the arts was the mandated 15% set-aside for projects benefiting handicapped children that went into effect in fiscal 1969, coincident with the states' take-over. But the overall drop in percentages (from 12% to 5%) supports a somewhat gloomier interpretation of these figures.

This interpretation gains further support from a second look at the table on

page 27, relating to numbers of new projects and continuation grants. The number of new projects approved in 1968 was 63, a cut of over 100% from the year before. In 1969, when the states took charge, the number dropped to 11, and then down to a total of only 4 last year.

The continuation actions, as listed on the same table, suggest mainly that commitments made by U.S.O.E. to continue projects into their second or third year were largely being honored by state Title III officials. In effect, they were living up to the obligations agreed upon when projects were initially approved -- but because of cuts in appropriations they were continuing projects at much lower funding levels than the original contracts stipulated. As a result, many on-going projects -- and not merely those in the arts and humanities -- were seriously crippled during the first and second years of state administration due to circumstances over which state Title III officials had little control.

From all of this, there would seem to be little question but what the arts under Title III have, in typical fashion, been caught in an administrative and financial squeeze -- a squeeze compounded in about equal parts of reduced appropriations, limited funds for "new" projects, confusions engendered by a shift of administrative authority, and a 3-year limitation on federal support.

But there is really no villain in the piece at all. I think it would be a mistake -- on the grounds that only four new arts projects were approved in 1970 -- to accuse state education department people of being opposed to or disinterested in the arts. It may simply have been that few projects in the arts were submitted, or that the

quality of those submitted was generally poor. In such circumstances, with a large proportion of the available funds taken up with continuation obligations, the funding of new projects of any kind is apt to have been minimal. Therefore, without knowing considerably more about the forces operating behind the scenes -- in meetings of state advisory councils, for example -- I would be reluctant to speculate further about it.

What seems to be clear is the end result, and I don't think there can be much doubt about that: a program under which support of the arts in education amounted to nearly $80 million over a five-year period seems to be grinding slowly to a halt -- and projects in the arts are therefore bound to suffer. For, as we have seen, the squeeze is on and, in the expected fashion, the arts will likely be among the early victims of Title III's gradual fall from Congressional -- or Administrative -- favor.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The future of Title III projects in the arts is dependent on so many factors that is is difficult to make any valid judgements about what may happen. The trend is obviously down in terms of numbers of projects and amounts of money. Presumably when most of the 88 projects which were continued into Fiscal 1970 end, it will free up more money for use in the "new projects" domain. But this is not a certainty by any means.

What actually happens will, in the end, depend on two things: the amounts Congress appropriates for this title, and the policies that the state agencies have hammered out these last several years in connection with the development of their State Plans. The results of each state's "critical educational needs" survey will have given them new guidelines for action and -- assuming the appropriations are adequate -- Title III projects are expected to become the principal instruments for translating these guidelines into operational form.

With this development in mind, then, it seemed appropriate to try to discover what place the arts -- and arts and humanities education generally -- had been accorded in the emerging educational priorities of the states. As the state agency officials with direct administrative responsibility for Title III, the State Coordinators could be presumed to know as much about their State Plans and Title III priorities as anyone. Accordingly, the opinions of each coordinator were solicited on these matters in a separate questionnaire that was included

with the forms requesting funding data on individual projects. It was designed to obtain a more general picture about state agency receptivity to Title III arts concerns, and also to elicit information about broader state agency issues relating to arts and humanities education (i.e., staffing patterns, etc.). A copy of this questionnaire is reproduced on pages 33G and 33F of this report.

How State Coordinators View Prospects for the Arts

The Title III Coordinators in 45 of the 51 states (including the District of Columbia) complied with our request for information and opinion. The general information form was not received from Indiana, West Virginia, Alaska, Georgia, Mississippi and the District.

In general, if one assumes that these coordinators reflect accurately the climate for continued support of arts and education projects under Title III in their respective states, the outlook is anything but optimistic. With respect to the State Plans, for example, a summary of coordinator responses shows that only 11 (24%) of the 45 states included arts and humanities education among the "Critical Educational Needs" listed in their current State Plans. Asked about relative priority, the responses of these eleven ranged from "Criticality #2" to "one of 15 most critical." Most appear not to have ranked the "Critical Needs" at all, merely listing them without priority.

It is interesting to note which eleven states came up with arts and humanities education as one of their critical educational needs. They were: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North and South

Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Virginia. Five of these states -- New York, Virginia, Colorado, Arkansas and Oklahoma -- were among the top third in the list of states ranked according to expenditures on arts projects; and six of them -- Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Colorado, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and North Dakota appear in the top third of the list of states ranked according to the percentage of total allocations spent on arts projects (i.e., the "arts effort" ranking). The newcomers to the arts fold, then, are three: Alabama, Minnesota, and South Dakota.

It seems to me, however, that a positive response from this relatively small number of states reveals the shape of the future more strongly than anything else in the questionnaire. It is indicative of the outcome of each state's "Needs Survey" and therefore of the relative attention that will be given to the arts in education generally by state education departments in the near future.

Curiously enough, this was followed by a question the response to which is surprisingly paradoxical, if not totally bewildering. Asked if they thought that local school systems would be likely to place increasing or decreasing emphasis on arts and humanities education in the years just ahead, 35 of these coordinators checked "increasing" (77%)! It may be that these Title III Coordinators look at things differently -- or at least that they dissent slightly from the official state position on this matter. Or it may be that they don't regard the need for arts and humanities education as critical at the local level. Whatever the reason, it is interesting to me that so many of these officials who, presumably are tuned in to educational needs across their states, think that local emphasis on

the arts is likely to increase.

This view is largely backed up by the responses they made to the next several questions:

* Well over half the coordinators (27 of them) said they expected to receive new Title III proposals in the arts and humanities for 1971 funding consideration;
* Asked to hazard a guess at how many proposals they expected, 20 of these 27 replied, and their estimates added up to a total of perhaps 55 or 60 proposals; assuming one in three is approved, we might look forward to between 18 and 20 new arts projects in Fiscal 1970-- but that is being unusually generous.
* On the other hand, asked to estimate the <u>percentage</u> of Title III funds likely to be allocated to such projects, only 15 of the original 27 replied, and their responses ranged as follows: two estimated 25%; four said 10%; and four more said 5%; other answers were "little, if any," and "low," and two said "$30,000" and "$10,000."
* Only 13 of the coordinators (29%) thought it likely that their state Title III programs would, in the near future, begin to place <u>increasing</u> emphasis on projects and programs in arts and humanities education; conversely, 25 (or 55%) said it was unlikely; 8 others didn't know or didn't answer;
* Of the 25 who thought it unlikely, the vast majority checked as the reason the statement that "other educational needs are of more urgent

priority."

Some gratuitous observations offered by several of the coordinators, apropos of the last question, throws the situation into bold relief. Twelve stressed lack of available funds as the reason for assigning such low priority to arts and humanities projects. Some of their comments were:

* "Funds are needed to continue existing programs -- plus 15% for the handicapped!" --
* "No encouragement at the state level at this time for arts and humanities proposals." --
* "Limited Congressional appropriations prohibit the funding of more than one or two new projects a year." --
* "Priorities fixed by the State Legislature" (a response I don't really understand) --
* "No new programs being funded."

All of which suggests that only in a handful of states (the eleven mentioned earlier) will there be any discernible emphasis on the arts and humanities by the state agency in the years ahead. Moreover, in only a few states does there seem to be any likelihood that this emphasis will be reflected in projects supported by Title III. These predictions are supported by other data, as well.

From our survey of individual projects, it appears that between 25-30 projects which were operational in Fiscal 1970 are likely to receive some kind of continuation funding under Title III in Fiscal 1971. In addition, if the coordinator's

estimates are sound, and between 18-20 new projects actually are approved, then something in the neighborhood of 45 or 50 Title III arts or arts-related projects will be active during the 1971 fiscal year. My private hunch is that the box-score will be closer to 30-35 projects when the chips are down and all the contingencies are taken into account -- and that the total funds involved will not greatly exceed a couple of million dollars nationwide.

Broader State Agency Concerns

With respect to broader state agency concerns, the questionnaires asked for information about the staffing capabilities of state education agencies with respect to specialists in arts and humanities education. A preliminary summary of the data on these questions appeared in my earlier report (in the section concerned with Title V), but it was based on replies from only 35 State Coordinators. With replies from 10 more coordinators now in hand, the more comprehensive picture that emerges can be summarized as follows:

* 16, or about a third, of the 45 responding states have a specific administrative unit concerned with arts and humanities education --
* Of those 16, 6 states appear to have a one-member staff, 2 have two professionals, 3 have 3 full-time people, 4 have 4, and New York state has 12 full-time people on the staff of its division.
* Art and Music, as expected, are the disciplines most commonly represented by staff positions in those 16 state units; next comes a position in Humanities Education (mentioned by 8 states) --

* Of the 29 states in which a special unit does not exist, it appears that 22 (or 76%) think it unlikely that the state agency will establish such a unit in the near future

* Nine of these same 29 states do not presently have any full-time specialists in arts and humanities education, either; of those 20 which do have specialists, the preponderence are in Music Education (18 positions) followed by Art Education (about 15) and Humanities Education (about 5).

In addition, 18 states indicated that Title V of ESEA (the title aimed at strengthening state agency capabilities) had been utilized to add staff positions in the arts and humanities field; 22 states, on the other hand, stated specifically that Title V had not been used in this way; 5 other states didn't know or left the question blank.

*

From this it would appear that the arts education picture is only slightly more encouraging when it comes to the growth of adequate staff capabilities in the state education agencies. I would not wish to rely fully on these figures, however, because many state education departments are large sprawling agencies in which it is seldom possible to keep up with personnel changes beyond one's own area of administrative jurisdiction. Certainly, staff capability in the humanities education field has been gradually improving over the years, and additions have apparently been made in the art and music education fields as well. But,

as I implied in my earlier report, the outlook for any significant new emphasis on arts and humanities education in the vast majority of state education agencies is not particularly bright, and the information on state department staffing patterns is merely one of the more visible signs of this de-emphasis.

I have included comment on this issue here because it is germane to the kinds of state agency policies which are being formalized in their official State Plans documents and which, ultimately, will be reflected in future grants under the Title III program. Until more states begin to assign some degree of criticality to arts and humanities education in their respective domains, it is unlikely that this staffing pattern will improve substantially. It is equally unlikely that very much Title III money will flow into projects concerned with the arts from now on. Moreover, this situation will prevail, I believe, so long as Title III appropriations remain at their current rock-bottom levels.

Thus the situation resolves itself into a kind of endless circle. At a time when schools everywhere are having a hard time securing adequate revenues from local tax sources, it is unrealistic to suppose that they will indulge heavily in any special effort to upgrade non-utilitarian programs such as those in the arts. They have understood, however, that Title III is essentially a local option program, in which local districts ultimately decide for themselves what their needs are and whether to apply for Title III funds to help change the situation. But when they look closely at Title III now -- in the third year of state administration -- they find that the tight money situation prevails there as

well. In addition, under the State Plan approach, they sense that the rules have been changed: they begin to realize that, if they want to improve their chances for approval of a Title III proposal, it probably ought to address itself to concerns that are in accordance with what the state education agency people and their consultants have decided are the state's Critical Educational Needs. So, unless the local district is located in a state -- such as Minnesota or New York -- which has listed arts and humanities education as critical, there would seem to be little point in submitting a proposal along those lines. Fewer proposals are submitted, therefore, fewer are approved, and the state education agencies begin to suspect that local school systems don't really consider the whole field very important after all. And what money there is in the state Title III pot goes increasingly to meet other needs.

This in no way implies that the other educational needs identified by the states are <u>not</u> critical, or that needs in the field of the arts and humanities are any more so. There is indeed a multiplicity of urgent educational needs these days and each has its ardent advocates. I am simply saying that, in such a situation, it is not surprising that the arts should feel the crunch earlier and more sharply.

TITLE III AND THE ARTS: A SUMMING UP

The five-year experience of Title III doesn't lend itself to simple summaries, particularly with regard to projects in the arts.

I suppose one could say the same thing about virtually every other Title III project category, but it does seem to me that the nearly 400 projects which have been studied in this report are particularly troublesome in this respect. Partly, I suspect, this is because The Arts are themselves somewhat troublesome to most inhabitants of the educational environment. They have not been standard classroom fare in our schools. They exist in a variety of forms and experiences and don't fit neatly into the usual curricular cubbyholes. And, most troublesome of all to teaching and learning strategists, they can't merely be taught, like most other subject matter; they apparently need to be appreciated -- and at times even engaged in experientially.

Administrators, artists and arts educators are just beginning, really, to open up the required dialogue with one another and ask some of the fundamental questions about this neglected aspect of the American educational experience. At a time, however, when the entire educational establishment is being subjected to crucial survival tests in many cities -- to pressures, diatribes, and instant solutions from all sides -- the introduction of thorny questions about how the arts should be taught in the schools seems slightly irrelevant. Except that really it isn't -- and about $80 million of Title III activity (not to mention

several hundred million dollars of Title I activity) these last five years testify to that fact.

When Title III came along, it gave the dialogue some substance and allowed the educational community, with the help of the artistic community, to try to find answers to some of the questions. I didn't consider it within the scope of this report to judge how well such questions might have been answered by these 393 projects in the arts. This has not been in any but the most superficial sense an evaluation of Title III arts projects, but rather a descriptive and somewhat analytical study.

It might well be regarded, I think, as a preliminary study -- because there are large, emminently-researchable questions remaining which qualified educational research types might well find worthy of more objective investigation. That matter of evaluation, for example -- trying to determine, before the trail is cold, how well some of the more intriguing projects did what they set out to do; whether they may have stumbled across some valuable insights and, as a result, gone in some unexpected directions and done some things they didn't set out to do; and whether, in the final analysis we (the arts education enterprise generally, I mean) have learned anything from all this that makes us any better off than we were before. Have we, for example, learned what not to do in some instances? Have we gotten clues about what kinds of things ought to be done before certain other kinds of things -- among a variety of sequence-and-continuity questions of this type?

I have thought of this study more as a matter of clearing out the statis-

tical underbrush so we might see the underlying terrain a little better. Hopefully it will help, if indeed there are later explorers who, knowing how to use the proper scientific tools, care to examine the ground more carefully and selectively. Meanwhile, having removed some of the underbrush, it may be appropriate for even the advance man with the bush-hook to make a few observations about what has come to light.

Many of the interesting issues have, of course, already emerged and I have commented on them gratuitously at various points as I went along. Let me, therefore, only summarize briefly here and then move on to some other observations that seem to me to grow out of them.

* There is the rather startling discovery of the large-scale regional or area center concerned with providing cultural services or educational resources to a group of schools. This discovery was startling -- to me, at least -- because although one of the title's stated intents was to establish "supplementary centers" I hadn't quite realized how many had been established, nor how many seemed to have cultural activities as their prime educational purpose.

Despite the fact that these were relatively high-cost projects, which brought into existence whole new layers of administrative and supervisory personnel, I am under the impression that their survival factor is strong. It would seem that large groups of local schools have, for a fact, been willing to take slices of their operating budgets and use them to buy pro rata shares of the services provided by

centers of this kind. On the other hand, I have been told by U.S.O.E. people familiar with Title III trends that one way these institutions managed to survive is to reduce the size of the geographic areas they serve, pulling in their horns, so to speak, in order to become more stable economically.

The phrase "cultural center," incidentally, does not generally have reference to the establishment of large, shiny new structures housing performing arts organizations on the order of Lincoln Center or the new cultural complex in Atlanta. With few exceptions, it refers to a group of administrative, advisory and supervisory people -- generally housed in leased facilities somewhere in the area -- whose culturally-oriented concerns have more to do with facilitating, sponsoring or arranging for cultural activities than with providing a performing home for artistic organizations. They serve, in a sense, as educational brokers in establishing a whole new set of relationships between the consortiums of schools and the performing groups in the area. This has taken the form, in sparsely-settled agricultural states, of mobile arts caravans and traveling teams of artists and teachers, as well as the touring of large and small performance programs.

They are thus new institutions, brought into existence under Title III, among whose multiple functions there would appear to be an effort of some significance to introduce arts events and services

into schools that ordinarily would not have access to them. From this point of view, I think, they have considerable developmental potential for broadening the services base of general education in the arts.

* There is some interesting information, it seems to me, in the section concerned with the relative emphasis each of the states put on Title III arts projects. I am not sure, however, how to evaluate it or what implications it has for future program development in those states. The high position of many of the poorer, rural states on the percentage tables might suggest that these states put relatively more of their available funds into Title III arts projects and pulled themselves up by their boot-straps. Of course, that word "relatively" is the catch-word. They may have put a good deal of what money they <u>had</u> into such projects, but they received very little to start with.

In some ways, this suggests that the interest in improving the arts-in-education situation is strong in these states, and that somehow program planners should begin to give more attention to them from this standpoint. On the other hand, it may be that what is really needed is some unrestricted federal money -- on the order of the original Title III money -- to undertake activities of a very practical and fundamental kind in these states, activities which have little to do with innovation, establishing models, or achieving educational break-throughs.

Stated bluntly, these poorer states require more money, simply because they are poor, to begin to carry out programs that the schools in most other states have been engaged in for some time. Any federal program formula based on total state population or on school-age population will naturally result in these states receiving a relatively smaller share of the available funds. But probably any program based on a different formula would have little chance of legislative approval, because the wealthy states would lobby against it on the grounds that their urban problems need as much if not more attention than problems stemming from cultural isolation, open spaces, small numbers of children in the schools, and lack of incentive for creative teachers to work there.

Thus, the picture that emerges from the data, with respect to arts projects in states such as this, is slightly blurred for me. I am uncertain how to interpret it and do not see, at the moment, what it suggests in the way of remediation. Perhaps the establishment of cultural and/or resource centers under Title III sponsorship was the most effective kind of action that could have been taken after all. And perhaps the implication is that, somehow, federal agencies need to work to support these centers through a variety of programs, so as to form a continuing partnership with state and local authorities that will maintain and develop them further as invaluable cultural resources for school and community use.

* Next, there is the range of complex questions concerning the performance-oriented projects -- in this instance, principally those which utilized established performing organizations of some stature (or, on occasion, brought new ones into being). As evidenced by comments throughout this report, projects of this kind have bothered me a good deal. My distress, however, has not stemmed from any disagreement with the fundamental idea (or the need) for exposing students to quality performing arts events, per se. It has evolved from personal familiarity with other aspects of these programs -- and they can be boiled down to perhaps three points:

1) The failure of many of these projects to concern themselves with the problem of integrating the performance experience with other aspects of the educational program or with other kinds of aesthetic experiences.

2) The failure to think very seriously about sequence and continuity with respect to educational levels and with respect to the performance experiences themselves.

3) The rather cavalier approach to economic considerations that characterized a good many of these performance projects, in which it often appeared that performing groups took on the task of providing performances for the schools with virtually no thought about whether the effort could be sustained (after

the money ran out) and made a regular part of the educational program.

In a sense, all three factors are characterized by a sort of hit-and-run philosophy which blithly ignored the complexities of Tomorrow's problems in the euphoria over Today's Federal Largess and indulged in a kind of self-conceit about the Rich Educational Values of Today's Aesthetic Experience.

To be sure, there was plenty of reason for these performing groups to become frustrated with the federal grant approach -- in which payments were often late, school administrators requested monthly reports, renewal requests were required before the present grant was even two-thirds over, and the threat of GAO audits forced a whole set of new bookkeeping methods on them which often ignored the operational realities of a resident performing company. The complaints on these scores were constant, and battles over them were a fact of Title III life. But, possibly because their energies were somewhat drained by these petty details, few people involved in these programs -- on either the school's side or the performing group's side -- ever managed to consider seriously what it was they were actually doing, and whether or not it would ever be really practical to continue it under non-federal auspices.

In retrospect, incidentally, I should mention one of the real over-sights in setting up most of these performance-oriented projects --

and I share the blame for this myself because I was involved in the development of several of them at the planning stage. The oversight was simply the failure to provide for support of a staff person to function solely as the project's Development Director, with few if any responsibilities of a day-to-day nature but concerned instead with that "tomorrow" when the federal faucet was turned off. We ought really to have known that this aspect of the problem would never be faced until the final termination date was near -- unless we saw to it that someone <u>did</u> face it. Had a development person been on hand from the start, he could have been working quietly in the background building relationships with the schools, the community, with parents and students, and exploring latent local resources which, taken together, might ultimately have made continuation possible.

For the economic fact of life is that -- on any scale which considers high artistic quality important or regular exposure of continuing generations of students to such performing arts events essential -- it is simply not going to be possible for most schools to finance these programs in the foreseeable future -- without outside help of some kind. It seems to me therefore that those educational systems which have such groups available, and believe the experiences they can provide <u>are</u> important to students, must evolve a rationale which considers the continuation factor in dead earnest.

And one of the first issues to be faced in any such consideration is the basic purpose behind it all — the whys and wherefores concerned with the flow of these events into a student's perceptual environment, questions of sequence, and the question of balancing the performance experience with cognitive study and with affective involvement in the creative process. Again, in most of the Title III performance projects, the educational people on the project staffs were too busy writing teacher guides, and worrying about scheduling, transportation, student discipline problems, play choices, and the like to give any real thought to these larger questions.

As a result, I don't believe education as a whole has really learned anything much it didn't know before from this whole experience -- except perhaps from the Educational Laboratory Theatre Program, and the results are not finally in yet on that experience. But, in that case, descriptive accounts were made of all developments, experimental studies were conducted and some admittedly tentative kinds of evaluative techniques were employed. In essence, then, a major attempt has been made to examine -- in three widely differing settings -- the whole concept of introducing high school students to professional theatre performances as a regular part of the school curriculum. From this, it seems to me, education may learn something fundamental about this entire performance-oriented approach to teaching about theatre in the schools -- and perhaps about performing artists programs generally.

* Next, there are those arts projects concerned mainly with what I have called "Curriculum Enrichment" and which, as I emphasized earlier, seemed to me to have perhaps the best opportunity of achieving some kind of permanent educational pay-off. Probably the term "Curriculum Enrichment" is a misleading term, because almost everything that tends to improve the student's educational environment could be regarded as enriching the curriculum.

However, as I tried to point out in that particular part of the report, I was attempting to identify projects in which the emphasis was on the development of processes, procedures, activities and materials which would continue to facilitate teaching and learning after the project, as such, had ended. Because they seemed to be aimed more at changing the ways in which the arts are taught in the regular school program rather than bringing in an occasional artistic dividend to delight and entertain a few children, they represent for me a wiser and more economical use of Title III money than projects addressed to other, often more grandiose purposes. Whether involving a single art form, or engaged in something more interdisciplinary, projects of this kind often included performance events but on a much simpler scale, at more regular intervals, and with considerably more personal contact between the artists and performers and between the students and teachers.

I am certainly not saying that these projects have all had profound

impact on the systems in which they were active, and that everything they worked on or worked with has now become beautifully meshed with the rest of the educational program. Obviously this is nonsense; they aren't and they haven't. But I do think they may have had a better chance at achieving outcomes along these lines than the larger, more prestigious projects which -- unless they survive as special projects -- have little to show for themselves. Only a few of these curriculum-enrichment projects have enjoyed the visibility of the more promotionally-oriented projects, and they may not have demonstrated anything other systems can readily adopt, but I suspect they have injected valuable new thoughts and practices about the arts into their own school systems nonetheless.

* This, of course, touches on the whole question of continuity as a measure of project "success." Many people, in U.S.O.E.'s Title III office and elsewhere, regard continuation of a project after the withdrawal of federal support as a significant "success" factor. If indeed it includes the concept I discussed immediately above, I think I would be in considerable agreement with this approach. The difficulty with this whole issue, in my opinion, is that we don't all use the same definition. We all hear about the difficulties project people have had sustaining a particular project (MECA, for example, or the Living Arts Program, or Classroom Renaissance), and this is followed

later by word that the project has not found the new sources of support it required and has therefore folded. Actually, as I tried to point out above, " the project" may have folded but, in many instances, some of the practices may be continuing -- not as fully or effectively, I'm sure, as the school or project people would have wished, but continuing.

On the other hand, when the phrase "continuing under local funding" is used, it is largely meaningless because we don't know -- for example -- if a project that operated on $125,000 a year under Title III auspices is now getting about the same amount from local sources or whether it means that local tax funds are paying perhaps $4000 a year for a part-time liaison person.

We have some extremely rough figures about continuation relating to arts projects but I'm almost afraid to use them because they were obtained from the State Coordinators and represent merely what they thought was happening with individual projects. Based on this very, very specious information, it appears that about 30 arts projects established with Title III funds were continuing this year, Fiscal 1970, without Title III support; another 60 or so projects are expected to continue in this manner in Fiscal 1971. But whether they actually do or not, and what the extent of the local support will be is anybody's guess. Which means that this kind of numbers game -- at least the kind based on

hearty hopes instead of actual occurance -- really should not be taken too seriously.

There may be some outstanding "success stories" around the nation, but, aside from Washington State's two-year support of the statewide cultural enrichment program at half a million a year, I haven't heard of very many. And even this one may not really represent true "success" but merely a very well-designed and well-executed campaign to sell the state legislators on keeping a highly visible and valuable project going -- because it apparently does reach students in some 400 schools in the state at least once a year with some performing event.

*

So "success" for a Title III project may be kind of a will-o'-the-wisp concept. Quite frankly, despite an almost endless variety of approaches used by Title III projects to effect improvements in the ways in which youngsters experience the arts in our schools, I find myself wondering more and more whether anything truly innovative and inventive has occurred.

As we have seen, the likelihood is that a great many of the practices which were supported because they were "innovative to the area introducing them" did little more than give poor schools a chance to engage in programs that wealthier and more sophisticated schools had been engaging in all along in one way or another. In a field which has been so peripheral to the educational process as the arts, this is perhaps justification enough. But it hardly lives up to the

original Title III billing whose central purpose was "to establish exemplary elementary and secondary school programs which will serve as models for American education."

To my knowledge, there have been very few programs established in the arts in education under Title III which can honestly be referred to as "models for American education." I wonder, in fact, whether it is really practicable in this field for a program to become so soundly established within the span of two or three years that other school systems in the area or around the nation can build on its premises and adapt it effectively for their own purposes. It seems to me that even if an effective model were to be developed, its replication elsewhere would depend strongly on a whole <u>new</u> cycle of grants from sources outside the system to finance the transplant process.

The fact is that viable programs are seldom replicated in toto. More often <u>the process</u> by which effective change is accomplished in one system is studied and experimented with over time by other systems in order to bring about similar changes. Take, for example, the ways in which it is possible for creative and performing artists to work in the schools -- either in residence over extended periods of time, or visiting classrooms periodically, or simply working occasionally with teachers. The people at the Connecticut Arts Commission think they have learned something of significance about this process through Project CREATE, but the distillation of that experience has yet to be disseminated very widely and the resulting refinements applied to new programs.

The residency situation for visual arts is being observed rather carefully by the CEMREL people. However, in this case, the project is not a Title III endeavor but a special program supported by the Endowment for the Arts (using $100,000 in transfer money from U.S.O.E.'s Bureau of Research). The year-long residency experience of six artists in different school environments around the country this past year is the situation under study. The program's second year is to be documented in a motion picture, which may encourage other schools around the country to try the same thing.

*

There must, of course, be other activities like this that have genuine model-like characteristics about them. The problem is that, unless an extraordinary effort is made by project people to disseminate what has been discovered, the rest of the nation remains ignorant of the would-be model. And dissemination has been a problem that has plagued Title III projects from the very beginning. Only a handful ot arts projects did much more than "publicize" events locally (they, of course, sent copies to U.S.O.E. to show how <u>well</u> they were disseminating); a few made motion pictures; some developed strip-films and others created imaginative slide-tape productions. But how to get these around in quantity to people elsewhere who could benefit from the ideas remains one of the truly unsolved issues of Title III administrative practice. The most common method of disseminating worthwhile ideas appears to be the educational conference or convention, especially the regional or area meeting.

But the difficulty with arts projects is that their value and excitement are often impossible to convey in words alone -- and arts projects directors seem, unaccountably, to be as inept as any run-of-the-mill civic group chairman when it comes to putting together anything visual that is at all imaginative and compelling. And almost inevitably the equipment breaks down on them in mid-presentation!

I have sometimes thought that the dissemination of worthwhile educational ideas, practices or programs may be the next great educational problem area requiring national attention and that the effort to disseminate these things might well need to be underwritten by public funds if the job is ever to be done adequately.

There always seems to be money available from some source to conduct demonstration programs in education but hardly any of it is spent to tell people facing similar problems elsewhere what the outcomes have been. Title III guidelines stressed dissemination until it seemed as though the project people ought to have it coming out of their ears (as well as their mouths and typewriters); but only infrequently was anything at all substantial either requested or stipulated in the projects' budgets to carry out an effective dissemination activity. Half-hour movies were made on a budget of $2500 and boasted about -- although the result was usually so incomprensible, inept and tedious that it put you to sleep before the first innovative idea appeared on the screen. And, to repeat, it has seemed to me that such examples are as typical of arts projects

people as they are of any other project category; either they ignore it or they simply do it badly.

So the questions remain: How can demonstration programs in the arts get disseminated? How do people learn about the good things when they do happen? The answer is: largely by accident -- in a magazine or by word of mouth. I suggest it may be time to think seriously about ways to put this process on a more systematically targeted basis.

*

I am of the opinion that many Title III programs have been badly misrepresented by a tendency on the part of federal program officers and local project people alike to regard them as "Demonstrations." Often, a project that has been labeled a demonstration project is really not "demonstrating" anything but is, rather, "experimenting" with something -- and therefore ought more aptly to be called "an experimental project" or "a pilot project."

This mis-labeling, it seems to me, puts the project which is probing tentatively in a new direction at a severe disadvantage because, realistically, we ought to expect more of a demonstration project than we do of a pilot project. Whatever is being demonstrated presumably is worth demonstrating since it's unlikely that anyone would want to demonstrate a practice that doesn't work. On the other hand, an experimental or pilot project may by definition succeed or fail, or succeed here and fail there, as perfectly legitimate outcomes of an experimental process. That's why they're experimenting with it: to find

out what works and what doesn't -- and hopefully why and how those outcomes came out as they did.

Presumably, if a pilot project had a high degree of success it might develop logically into a follow-up activity that would be worth demonstrating somewhere. If the demonstration held up, the hope would be that other schools, in the same system as well as in other locations, would go and do likewise -- or as "likewise" as their own circumstances permitted. (Among the many wise things The New Republic's Joseph Featherstone has written, this one sticks in my mind apropos of demonstrations: "New York City has tried out every good idea in educational history -- once.")

So -- perhaps we've really been dealing, more often than not, with pilot projects than we have with demonstration projects, at least with respect to many of the arts projects or programs which have recieved support from Title III or Title I of ESEA. I would hazard a guess that there are only a few programs involving new ways of teaching in or about the arts which can or should be demonstrated these days; but I suspect there are a host of new approaches that are worth experimenting with somewhere. This is precisely why Title III's Planning Projects were often as valuable as Operational Projects -- because they could establish "pilot projects" that were truly experimental instead of being pressured to demonstrate something before they were ready. And it's why many Operational Projects got in way over their heads trying to demonstrate something which ought to have been considered an experiment.

The point in making the distinction is this: we have usually expected too much

from these Title III Operational Projects too soon. And, because they often have been unable successfully to demonstrate in one, or two, or three years that "the youngsters behave differently" due to this or that involvement in the arts, we have cut them off abruptly. And what, by the way, is so magical about the number Three? Everywhere one turns these days, three-year projects have ended, are just about to end, or (occasionally) are just being initiated. (More of them seem "just about to end," I suspect, because this is the year when many of the Title III projects which began during Fiscal 1968 are ending their three-year cycles -- and so I presume this is true all across the Title III board, not just with arts projects). Not long ago, educators apparently believed there was something rather magical about the number 30, in terms of the number of kids a teacher should be responsible for in a classroom. They found out, of course, that not only was that stricture constantly being violated, but that there was really nothing magical about it, anyway. Under some conditions, and for certain purposes, you might find it effective to work closely with three kids,or with 100 or 150 in what has been referred to as "large-group instruction".

I sometimes think it's time to apply similarly flexible approaches to the traditional "three-year project." Program officers apparently have a kind of automatic rule of thumb about those projects which can and should be carried out in one or two years; but they seldom seem to regard anything over three as worthwhile -- or, perhaps the word is "viable." In federal programs, of course, this is partly a function of the two-year and four-year cycles

relating to national elections; it is almost certainly a function of the manner in which Congress authorizes certain programs. Only in rare instances is a program initiated which has a guaranteed continuity of more than a few years built into it; it is obviously very difficult to get Congress to make a program semi-permanent (that is, requiring that Congress act to end it rather than to continue it). And there is always the "annual appropriation measure" to conjure with, which makes government administrators use such terms as "approved for a three-year period, subject to Congressional appropriations."

This kind of three-year now-you-see-it, now-you-don't approach to federal grant-making may not appeal to project directors or school officials when it comes to education programs generally -- but they have somehow learned to live with it. The indications of real effect on students, the evidence that something is working, often can be determined within a three-year span in the regular subject matter fields. However, I am of the opinion that it makes the situation almost untenable for certain pilot projects involving the arts in education. In many aspects of the arts there are as yet few reliable devices for determining whether some new approach is indeed worth all the bother and expense. Perhaps more longitudinal studies are what is needed in the arts -- but obviously for this approach to produce worthwhile results, and for many other aesthetic outcomes which someday we may learn to identify and evaluate, longer periods of time are needed for experimental work.

It would be refreshing sometime to have a government program approve and

support a pilot educational project in the arts for a five- or a ten-year period. It would, for once, be a recognition of the fact that the arts are a different breed of cat. Educational experiences in the arts may reveal their effects on the student way down the track, five or ten years later -- in the creative way he expresses himself, the heightened ways in which he senses or perceives the world around him, in how he acts or reacts in personal relationships, how he handles himself in new situations, makes decisions involving aesthetic values, etc., etc., etc. These are really the sorts of ultimate pay-offs we ought to be looking for in programs dealing with the arts in general education, and they very seldom reveal themselves to researchers, teachers, or administrators (so they in turn, can reassure school board members, parents, and interested citizens) at the end of a three-year pilot project.

This is, in my view, the real reason why it has been distressing to see so many promising, though not necessarily successful, Title III projects die off at the end of three years. Virtually all of the projects represented at the Foundation-sponsored meeting of Title III project people early in May were vulnerable from this point of view. Valuable projects with hardly any exceptions, they had not really had time to become "successful." Some of the most interesting were those I mentioned in an earlier section as belonging to the category of project I termed Curriculum Enrichment. In a sense, they had managed by now to establish some new arts beachheads in their respective schools and that's about all. But in their own ways (each different from the other) they were obviously working seriously toward something new in arts

education, something they had seen evolve gradually as they moved through the first three years and now saw as purposes that needed an additional few years to be more fully realized.

Several were working directly in curriculum development activities (Classroom Renasissance, EPOCH, and the Attleboro Visual Arts Project); some were working on new ways to train teachers (including the Academy Theatre Renaissance, Project TRY, and the Related Arts Program); others were experimenting with ways of working with artists in school situations (Green Bay's Area Arts and MECA); some were even beginning to resolve problems concerned with continuation of heavily-funded performance programs (Washington State's project). By now, I suspect, all but a few have gone under: Dayton's Living Arts, MECA, Classroom Renaissance, Colorado Springs' Humanities Education Program, Operation Area Arts in Green Bay, Project TRY in New Hampshire, the Attleboro Project, Project CREATE, and perhaps others as well. The big surprise, of course, is that the large performance-oriented projects in the State of Washington have continued as a single Cultural Enrichment package under state sponsorship -- which neatly contradicts my previously-expressed thesis that the high-cost performance programs tend not to get continued when the federal funds run out! But it may be the exception that proves the rule.

As for the others, the tragedy is that money will probably have been wasted by allowing them to die off. It will be unlikely now that anything much will be disseminated about most of them -- because, with the exception of the Attleboro Project, perhaps they really had nothing to <u>demonstrate</u> yet! They were

indeed still experimenting, but they were closing the gap year by year; and perhaps, by the end of another two, three or four years, it would have been possible to discover whole groups of students who really would be "behaving differently" because of their exposure to and involvement in these arts processes. Perhaps, too, within the next several years, some of the sound educational researchers working in this field would have begun to zero in on some different kinds of devices for assessing programs such as these, so that the word evaluation would be more than a dirty word to the artists, a joke to the students, and a frustrating puzzle to the educators. Indeed, some of the people in these projects have begun to evolve evaluation instruments of their own that seem to have considerable assessment potential. (In connection with the problem of evaluation, I am appending to this report a copy of an interesting paper by James Hoetger, of the CEMREL staff, entitled "The Limitations and Advantages of Behavioral Objectives in the Arts and Humanities.")

Finally, the real waste is that much of what's been developed here will be lost to the larger educational enterprise, even if it is retained in butchered form within the individual school systems. It takes a long time for a project to shake down and find its particular method of coping with the school milieu. The staffs will scatter, the work will dissipate, and when (hopefully) the money does become available again, it's likely that the work will have to begin all over again, largely from scratch.

The lesson in all this is clear -- in my opinion: such work as this needs

longer experimental time because, in many ways, it is operating in a field with far fewer certainties than other subject-matter areas -- and it simply needs time to close these gaps. If pilot projects (as opposed to demonstration projects) make any kind of sense at all in this field -- and I think they do -- they should indeed be looked at differently from pilot projects in other educational fields, and be given greater developmental flexibility. Only then, given time to see some things through to the end, and time to edge closer to evaluation techniques that may mean something, and some money to document what takes place so it can indeed be disseminated if it turns out to be really useful -- only then, I think, will it make educational and economic sense to initiate arts projects of the Title III variety again.

It is with a considerable sense of outrage, then, that I have observed the process by which the belatedly-restored EPDA money was parceled out to the five "Arts IMPACT" projects, described in some detail in my earlier report (pages 78-81). With some promising school-based Title III projects sitting in mid-stream, as it were, desperately in need of funds to keep their experimental programs going forward, this teacher training money went to five new places where it will be used to set up "a million dollar experiment in using the arts -- dance, drama, music, the visual arts -- to improve the total educational climate of the schools."

$200,000 will go to each of the five school sites over a two-year period where, with a great deal of outside consultant help, these new experimental

programs will be set in motion. The fact is, of course, that there are at least five Title III projects which could have put $200,000 immediately to work in teacher education activities without having to go through the preliminary spade work all over again.

It is further proof, if any is needed, that federal programs -- even those housed in the same agency -- tend to proceed with a kind of tunnel vision along highways of their own devising. They seldom know where the promising practices developed under other programs are located, and if they do happen on them it is likely they would view it as a loss of prestige to pick up the work of another program at mid-point and help it further along the road to a genuinely valuable destination.

*

In an article entitled "On Looking Gift Horses in the Mouth: The Federal Government and the Schools," Dean J. Myron Atkin, of the College of Education at the University of Illinois, recently made a number of thoughtful and pertinent observations about the short-term perspective that is characteristic of federal program planning. I am appending his article to this report because it hits many nails soundly on the head, but I want to quote directly here several points he makes:

> "The unhappy fact today is that local educational authorities are being severely strained to sustain educational programs at even a minimal base line of quality. They are receiving, through their immediate revenue sources, precious little money with which to embark on new programs. The days of the incremental budget are rapidly drawing to a close. When school districts were expanding rapidly and when state and local monies were easier to obtain than they are today, it

was possible, to a certain extent, to mount impressive new efforts. It is harder to do so now. It appears that the only major source of resources for new programs will come from the federal government. When these innovations are all designed for short-term political pay-off, there is cause for concern.

The term 'political pay-off' is not used in a perjorative sense. It is becoming a requirement, however, for a federal administration to show in a reasonably short period of time that large amounts of money spent for social improvement result in significant changes. The short-term nature of the perspective brought to our tasks by federal officials represents one major issue that should be in the forefront of educational thinking as we examine new sources of fund from the federal government for novel programs."

The application of this federal perspective to Title III generally and to its projects in the arts in particular is obvious. Moreover, with reference to evaluation of such projects, Dean Atkin makes another pertinent point:

> "There is little doubt that one of the primary reasons for the popularity of the systems approach to social planning is the fact that it is more susceptible to reliable assessment, to ready evaluation. When one specifies in advance what one is trying to do, it is necessary only to see how well one has achieved his goal in order to judge the effectiveness of the program. We are learning that it is expected that we be 'accountable.' Those programs are pressed which are most amenable to accountability. If it is going to be difficult to measure the effects of the program, there seems to be good reason to stay away from it; it will be difficult to justify financial support."

This indeed is precisely the nature of the assessment problem with respect to many Title III arts projects. And it is one reason, I suspect, why it has been hard to continue them beyond their three-year termination points. For Accountability is indeed the watchword for assessing Title III project accomplish-

ments these days. It has been a policy development promulgated in detailed fashion by U.S.O.E.'s Title III program officers this spring and -- complete with a ten-point check list -- is being pressed on state coordinators as the assessment method they ought to employ with respect to Title III projects in the future. And the word is that, although the U.S.O.E. officials know it will be "difficult" for some of the projects in the arts and humanities to apply it to their work, they will simply have to make the effort or drop by the wayside. Dean Atkin, who wrote his article nearly eighteen months ago, couldn't have read the Title III tea leaves more accurately.

*

Lest I come through too heavily on the gloomy side in this summary of Title III projects in the arts, I want to refer to a study by two University of California educational authorities which lists a whole group of ways "in which Title III projects have demonstrated success potential for future contributions to education." My reason for doing so is that, generally speaking, I believe that a great many arts projects have exhibited one or more of these "success potentials." The study, which covered the first three fiscal years of Title III and came out in December of 1968, selected 60 projects in 30 states to examine at close range (among them several projects in the arts). Its authors, Charles S. Benson and James W. Guthrie, entitled the study: "A Search for New Energy: ESEA Title III" and sub-titled it "An Essay on Federal Incentives and Local and State Initiative."

It is the contention of this study that Title III's principal contribution to education has been that it enabled American education to find new ways of "breaking the instructional mold and stimulating instructional reform." The several ways in which Benson and Guthrie feel this actually happened were:

* It encouraged experimentation in individualizing instruction;
* It "triggered curriculum change" and stimulated educators to seek new ways of enriching and extending the curriculum;
* It served as a catalyst in the development of experiments which aimed at integrating the curriculum;
* It pioneered the development of a more productive educational technology (making it possible, for example, for teachers to reach wider audiences);
* It assisted in laying the groundwork for new measuring techniques which may stimulate reforms in educational assessment;
* It encouraged interdistrict cooperation, so that one district's strengths compensated for another's weaknesses (using as its principal instrument the multi-district project which established regional and area centers);
* It provided more effective programs in Special Education (with programs for the gifted as well as the handicapped); and
* It provided incentives for unearthing very capable people who were willing to take risks with their own security to try out a new idea.

Virtually all of these methods or approaches were implicit in the arts projects which have been discussed in this report. Title III did indeed serve the arts in education in all of these ways. That the task may have been more difficult and more challenging with respect to arts projects does not mitigate the points Benson and Guthrie have made; it <u>does</u> imply that the "success potential" they speak of has perhaps a more immediate applicability to projects in the arts precisely because most of them exhibit an exciting potential rather than demonstrable successes

*

The opinions and observations expressed throughout this report have been enormously informed by the collective insights which were provided by the Title III project representatives who attended the two-day meeting at the Foundation in early May. I am grateful to all of them for sharing with me the distillation of their personal experiences with such a variety of arts projects around the country. As noted earlier, the names of these unusually thoughtful and dedicated people and the projects they represented, appear in a listing which is appended to the report.

While I am certain that none of them would agree with everything I have said in these pages, I suspect that <u>many</u> of them would agree with <u>much</u> of it. I have tried in my comments to reflect accurately the range of concerns expressed at this meeting, particularly those which applied directly to the broadly analytical purposes of this report. In effect, I have tried to express "a sense of the

meeting," and have not therefore included all the reservations individuals may have had about broadly agreed-upon issues. Other viewpoints and opinions of a more philosophical nature, also advanced at the meeting, related mainly to discussions of human values associated with experiences in the arts and their place in the educational process. Although fascinating and valuable, they do not belong in this report -- and even if they did, it would extend its length beyond what I fear is already too lengthy a document. It may be that these viewpoints can be brought together and justice done to them in some kind of narrative summary at a later time.

*

Finally, I should conclude by stating that nothing which has emerged from this more detailed scrutiny of a specific federal program alters significantly what I consider to be the issues most urgently needing attention in this arts-in-education field and which I listed at the end of my earlier report.

If anything, I suppose I am even more convinced than ever of the absolutely crucial need for schools of education to begin changing the ways in which they teach would-be elementary teachers about the arts. Little was accomplished under Title III to alter this situation -- it was not, after all, a program to support the education of teachers. It could, and did, support the so-called in-service aspects of teacher education -- and some of the projects in the arts which had this as either a major or minor emphasis have been noted in the course of this report. Work along these lines is certainly better than nothing, and I do not wish to cast aspersions on it in any way. Much of it is valuable and I

hope ways to support more of it can be found. The problem is that it is simply not enough, in and of itself, to produce any appreciable change in the near future in the ways in which the majority of elementary teachers deal with the arts in the nation's classrooms.

Some of the institutions responsible for pre-service preparation of teachers, particularly teachers who plan to work in the elementary grades, are already beginning to show signs of responding to the winds of change in other areas. I wonder if a few of them might not be responsive to the infusion into their training processes of some widely-differing experimental approaches to teaching and learning in the arts. It is certainly not the only thing that needs doing in this field, but it is -- in my opinion -- high on the list.

*

REFERENCES

1. The members of the President's Task Force on Education included, in addition to Mr. Gardner, such educational and civic leaders as James B. Conant; Dr. James Allen, New York's Commissioner of Education; Meredith Wilson, President of the University of Minnesota; Harold Gores, President of the Educational Facilities Laboratories; Sidney Marland, Pittsburg's Superintendent of Schools; Whitney Young; Ralph Tyler; Cleveland's Mayor Anthony Celebreze; former Governor of North Carolina Terry Sanford; and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel.

2. For much of the information in this report about the Task Force, and the evolution of ESEA -- and particularly about the influences which shaped Title III -- I would like to give particular credit to an article by Doris Kearns entitled "The Growth and Development of Title III, ESEA," which appeared in the May, 1969, issue of Educational Technology. Miss Kearns, presently at Harvard University, was Special Assistant to President Johnson until January, 1969.

3. "The Rocky Road Called Innovation," The Second Annual Report of the President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January, 1970) p. 2.

4. The original members of the National Advisory Committee for Title III were: Sister Mirium J. Farrell, Supervisor of the Arts Diocesis in Gillroy, California; Dr. Jacob I. Hartstein, President of Kingsboro Community College in Brooklyn; Arthur Naftaline, Mayor of Minneapolis; James Quigg Newton, Jr., President of the Commonwealth Fund in New York City; Harry M. Sparks, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Kentucky; Dr. Andrew P. Torrence, Dean of Academic Affairs at Tuskeegie Institute; H. Bradford Washburn, Jr., Director of the Boston Museum of Science; and Mrs. John F. Lewis. Commissioner Howe served as Chairman.

5. Focus on Innovation, A Report on the Status and Operation of ESEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1969; Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Office of Education), January, 1970. (NOTE: The copy of this report made available to me was a final duplicated draft; it may by now be available as an official GPO publication.)

FORD FOUNDATION MEETING OF

TITLE III ARTS PROJECTS REPRESENTATIVES

May 5 - 7, 1970

Participants

Miss Dorothy Bennett, Director
EPOCH (Berkeley Public Schools)
1033 Heinz Avenue
Berkeley, California 94710

Mr. Jack DeVelbiss, Director
Living Arts Program
The Dayton City Schools
612 Linden Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45403

Mr. Donald Brigham, Director
Center for the Visual Arts in Education
Attleboro High School
Attleboro, Massachusetts 02703

Dr. Arthur Custer, Director
Metropolitan Education Center in the Arts
4236 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

Mr. Charles Gaines, former Director
Operation Area Arts in Green Bay,
Wisconsin
Job's Creek Road
Sunapee, New Hampshire

Mr. Don A. Green, Project Director
Arts and Humanities Education Program
Palmer Hall, Room 218, Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

Miss Judith Kase, former Director
New Hampshire's Project TRY
Department of Theatre
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33620

Mr. Anthony Keller, Executive Director
Connecticut Commission on the Arts
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Dr. Gerard Knieter, former Director
Summer Inservice Workshop of the Pennsylvania
Fine Arts Project
College of Music, Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Mr. Clint Marantz, former Director
Huntington Station PACE Project
B.O.C.E.S. III Humanities and Arts Program
1328 New York Avenue
Huntington Station, New York 11746

Mr. Keith Martin, Director
Roberson Center for the Arts and Sciences
30 Front Street
Binghampton, New York 13905

Dr. Thelma Newman, Director
Classroom Renaissance (state-wide project)
930 Stuvyesant Avenue
Union, New Jersey 07083

Mr. Dix Stallings, Director
Arkansas Valley Cultural Enrichment Project
Post Office Box 156
Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Mr. James Stewart, Director
Washington State Cultural Enrichment Program
305 Harrison Street
Seattle, Washington 98109

Miss Shirley Trusty
Supervisor of Cultural Resources
Hyman Building
731 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

Mr. Frank Wittow, Director
Academy Theatre
3213 Roswell Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30305